TRUTHS DEFENCE:

Or, the Pretended

EXAMINATION

BY

John Alexander of *Leith*,

Of the Principles of those (called

QUAKERS)

Falsly termed by him

Jesuitico-Quakerism,

Re-Examined

AND

Confuted,

Together with

Some Animadversions on the Dedication of his Book to Sir *Robert Clayton*, then Major of *London*.

By *G. K.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Benjamin Clark* in *George-Yard* in *Lombard-street*, Bookseller, 1682.

TRUTHS DEFENCE:

Or, Quaternaried

EXAMINATION

BY

Joh. Alexander of Leith,

Of the Principles of those called

QUAKERS,

Falsly termed by him

Jesuitico-Quakerism,

Re-Examined

AND

Confuted,

Together with

Some Animadversions on the Dedication of his Book to Sir *Robert Clayton*, then Major of *London*.

By G. K.

LONDON,

Printed for Benjamin Clark, in George Yard in Lombard-street, Bookie, etc. 1682.

The pretended Examination of the Principles of thoſe called Quakers (*Falſly called* Jeſuitico-Quakeriſm) *by* John Alexander *in* Leith, *Re-examined and Confuted, by* G. K.

CHAP. I.

IN my Anſwer to this pretended Examination of *J. A.* I intend to obſerve on his Anſwer to every Queſtion wherein he miſrepreſents, or perverts the ſtate of the Queſtion; and wherein he hath miſſed to Anſwer it: Alſo to Anſwer briefly, but I hope ſufficiently and diſtinctly what is neceſſary to the

Vindication of Truth, (not to every Word or Sentence, nor to every frivolous and weak or impertinent Argument, where the solution thereof lyeth obvious to any ordinary understanding, but) to any thing alledged by him that seemeth Material, or to require an Answer, referring the Enquiring and Truth-loving Reader to divers Treatises already published (not to mention our Friends books in *England*) by some here in *Scotland*, to wit, *R. B.* his *Apology*, also to his Answer in Vindication thereof to *J. B.* also his book called, *Truth cleared of Calumnies, in Answer to* W.M. *in* Aberden. And the Answer given by the said *R. B.* and me to the Students of *Aberden*; as also to divers Treatises published by me, such as my book of *Immediate Revelation*, my book of *Universal Grace*, my book called, *The Way cast up*, my book called, *The Rector Corrected*, *in Answer to* T. W. who calls himself *Rector of Arrow*, and lastly to my book called, *Quakerism no Popery*. And though to this last book *J. A.* hath replyed in some few particulars, which I purpose, so far as may seem requisite, to Answer; yet he hath quite passed by the most material passages, and especially all the Authorities and Testimonies of Ancient Writers; and also of the Protestants brought by me, as concurring with the Scriptures Testimony, to clear us of that

imputation of *Popery* falsly charged upon us by *J. M.* To none of which weighty Testimonies hath the said *J. A.* replyed one word. Now because there is little or nothing that seems Material of *J. A.* his Objections that is not already fully answered in these Books and Treatises above mentioned, therefore I Judge it not needful to Write a large or particular Answer to every thing; yet lest he should seem too wise in his own Eyes, or lest he and others that favour him, should think he is stronger, than really he is; and especially to prevent the stumbling of the weak, into whose hands his book may come. I purpose, through the Lords Assistance, to reply some things, which may suffice on every Head or Section.

What hath induced *J. A.* to Dedicate his book against us, to the Mayor of *London*, may seem no impertinent Query. Had he none in all his Native Country whom he had confidence in to Patronize his undertakings? Or being Conscious of his small esteem at home, did he despair to find any Liberal *Mecenas* in *Scotland*, and therefore he must go so far as *London* to find out one, and that no less then the Mayor himself, to whom it may be supposed *J. A.* his greatest commendation was his being a stranger: And that he saith in his Epistle to the said Eminent

perſon; *His Treatiſe preſums not to add any luſtre to his Name, whereof it is uncapable*: That may well be believed, that his Book is indeed uncapable of adding any luſtre thereunto. But why was he not afraid that it would detract from his luſtre? It were good, that thoſe Eminent perſons in the World, who ſuffer men to Superſcribe their Names as Patrons to their Books, did firſt examine them diligently, if they did deſerve any ſuch Patronage, leſt Error masking it ſelf under the name of Truth, ſeek the Protection, as is too common now in the World. And for my part, I have no ſmall conjecture, that if the ſaid Eminent perſon, to whom this diſingenuous and impertinent piece by *J. A.* is Dedicated, had but taken the leiſure or pains, to review but one ſixth part of it, he had never ſuffered his Name to be ſuperſcribed to it. And I am very hopeful that the Mayor of *London*, who hath divers thouſands of that people, within his Precinct in that Famous City, many of whom I judge are better known to him, than *J. A.* ever was, hath more charity towards the people called in ſcorn *Quakers*, than to believe *J. A.* his deſcription of them in his ſaid Epiſtle; were he expreſly alledgeth on them, *That they renounce all true Principles of Religion, and ſtifle their very faculties of Reaſon*; charging them

them also with Absurdity: And in his Preface to the Reader he calleth them, *Uncircumcised Philistins and reproachful Adversaries; having in their Queries and other Papers, disgorged as many Lies against God and his Truth, and as many Slanders against the Church of God in* Brittain, *as if they had exchanged both Persons and Offices with the Father of Lies and Accuser of the Brethren.* But if that Eminent person, whose Name and Favour this *J. A.* hath abused, shall please to look into this small Treatise, in Answer to that of *J. A.* I hope he shall find, that they are falsly charged with those Crimes. It seemeth no new or strange thing to us to be so falsly accused, knowing that not only our Fellow Servants and Brethren in former Generations, have been so used, but also the Head himself, and Captain of our Salvation, the Lord Jesus Christ, was not only numbred among transgressors, but called a Blasphemer, and said to have a Devil: And the Lord forewarned his Disciples and Followers that they should be so lied upon, and all manner of evil things said against them falsly for his Name sake. *But rejoyce,* said he, *and be glad, for great is your reward in Heaven.*

Now whereas *J. A.* calleth his Book, *A Vindication of the Church of God in* Brittain, he ought to have told what Church he

meant, seeing there are divers sorts of people in *Brittain*, who call themselves the Church of God, and yet in divers things Dissent from *J. A.* And upon review of his Book, I find the said *J. A.* his Principles to be almost wholly *Calvinistical*, and particularly, 1. *That he denyeth the Universal Grace of God, or that Christ hath died for all men.* 2. *That he denyeth that God hath any regard to the new Creature, or work of Conversion, or Repentance to be so much as a condition requisite in order to our Justification.* 3. *That he denyeth that any can be free from actual sining in this Life by any Grace of God given them, or to be given.* These and other principles alledged by him, which are wholly *Calvinistical*, are as much disliked by many and some of those, the most considerable, of the Episcopal Church in *Brittain*, as by us. And I judge that *J. A.* should hold himself a Member of this Episcopal Church, seeing he himself Officiates as Reader and Presentor at at *Leith*, under *John Hamilton* an Episcopal Preacher, who hath also recommended his Book. And therefore seeing *J. A.* hath undertaken the Vindication of the Church of God in *Brittain*, as he alledgeth against the *Quakers*; he must either acknowledge, that the Episcopal Church in *Brittain* is not the Church of God, whereof he is a professed Member, or else have proved out of the the Episcopal

Church

Church now in *Brittain*, that he avoweth and owneth such principles, all and every one, as he asserteth; and that those Eminent and Noted persons, both in *England* and *Scotland*, who dissent from him, and agree with us, in those principles already mentioned, are Hereticks, and renouncers of true principles of Religion, stifling the faculties of reason; such as among others in *England*, *R. Cudworth*, and *H. More*, accounted great Doctors, also *William Sharlock*, and *J. A.* his Reverend and much admired *Rich. Baxter*, whom he particularly opposeth in the matter of Justification: And in *Scotland*, Bishop *William Forbes* in his Treatise called, *Considerationes modestæ & pacificæ Controversy.* As also divers other persons of Note yet living, whose Names I need not to mention; all which I suppose, and thousands more in the Episcopal Church in *Brittain*, of all Qualities and Ranks, will be loath to acknowledge *J. A.* for a Patron or Defender of their Faith; but rather find fault with him in those things, as an Enemy of their Faith, and in other things a bewrayer and betrayer of it, rather then a Defender. In his Preface to the Reader, he excuseth himself that he hath not Cited any humane Testimonies (meaning Authorities of Ancient and Modern Writers) against us *Seeing these* (saith he) *they do not value*, except

cept when they think they make for them, eſpecially *ad hominem*. And with this ſlender pretext, I ſuppoſe he thinketh to evade the many Teſtimonies I brought to confirm the Truth of our principles, in my Book called *Quakeriſm no Popery*, even out of Writters both Ancient and late, of great eſteem among them; none of which he hath once ſo much as touched. But to Anſwer to his Charge, I ſay, we value the Teſtimonies of all Writers, whether Ancient or late, which are true, and agree with the Scriptures, as much as any Proteſtants do, or more than he doth. And ſeeing he imputeth it as a fault to us, that we will not own the Teſtimonies of others, againſt us; I ask him, if he would own or value any Teſtimonies of Authors that make againſt him, or his Judgment? If he ſay nay, then his excuſe is removed, and he hath nought to ſay for this omiſſion. But the matter ſeemeth to be in effect, that thoſe Teſtimonies adduced by me in the foreſaid Treatiſe he knew not how to Anſwer, unleſs by ſaying that thoſe perſons erred in thoſe principles, as much as we, which he was loath to acknowledge, leſt he ſhould ſeem to weaken the Charge of his Title againſt us, and acknowledge his own party, and thoſe that are more worth of Credit than himſelf, equally guilty of *Jeſuitiſm* with the people called

called *Quakers*, wherewith he doth falſly accuſe them.

And here I ſhall give a Liſt or Catalogue of divers groſs Perverſions and Calumnies, whereby he ſeeketh to abuſe his Reader, in the very Preface of his book againſt us: As 1. *That we rejeit all manner of External Ordinances*; Which is notoriouſly falſe, as all who have the leaſt knowledge of us can witneſs; that we are for Meeting together, and that frequently; and when we meet, to Preach, Exhort, Pray, and give Thanks to God in Audible words, as the Spirit of the Lord doth help us: And can *J. A.* ſay that none of theſe are External Ordinances or Appointments; and we challenge him to inſtance any one External Ordinance or Appointment of God that is truly ſo, which we are againſt: For it is but only humane Inſtitutions, (and Aboliſhed ſhadows) ſet up as Divine Ordinances which we oppoſe, as in the Sequel of this Treatiſe doth appear. 2. He ſaith, *We do directly ſtrike at the Foundation of all with one blow, overturning (ſo far as we can) the whole rule of Faith and Duty, ſetting a new one of our own Invention in the room thereof.* But why doth he charge us ſo highly in this matter? becauſe we cannot own the Letter or External Teſtimony of the Scriptures, as the primary Rule or Foundation of Faith; but only Chriſt

Christ Jesus, the first and last; concerning whom *Paul* hath writ, *That another foundation no man can lay, then that which is laid already, which is Christ Jesus. And said the Lord, behold I lay in* Zion *an Elect precious Corner stone, a sure foundation:* Which to be sure, is not the Letter, but Christ and his Spirit, Light and Life revealed in the heart. And I Query this Accuser *J. A.* whether, if to acknowledge Christ in his immediate Teachings by his Spirit in mens hearts, is to set up a false Foundation or overturn the true one; the Apostles are guilty of this Charge, as to their own particulars; seeing *J. A.* will not deny, but that the Apostles had Christ immediatly to Teach them, and speak in them: And was it not the Apostle *Paul* his labour to build the Churches upon Christ, that their Faith might not stand in men, (though sent and moved of God) but in the power of God. And though *J. A.* blame us for setting up the Light within for the Rule, yet Christ taught people to believe in the Light, and that this Light was not the Scripture, which he bid them believe in is clear; that he said, *While ye have the Light, believe in the Light, that ye may be the Children of it:* This clearly Imports, that this Light should not long remain with them, if they did not believe in it, as he said in the foregoing Verse, *Yet a little while is the Light with*

with you; walk while ye have the Light, leſt darkneſs come upon you, ſee *John* 12. 35, 36. And indeed the gracious Viſitation of Light did not long after remain with them who did reject it, althogh the Scriptures did remain with them: And therefore the Light which he bid them believe in, was not the Letter of the Scripture, but Chriſt himſelf, who ſaid, *I am the Light of the World.* 3. He ſaith, *This Hereſie* (ſo he calleth our Faith) *is a very Sink, or an Univerſal Syſtem of almoſt all the groſs Errors, which hitherto have annoyed the Church of God:* And herein he doth imitate *J. Brown*, and the Author of the *Poſtſcript to S. R.* his *Epiſtles*, who have ſo charged us; but how unjuſtly, we hope our Anſwers do ſufficiently evince: And ſurely this *J. A.* in the Art of Slandering and falſe Accuſing, may paſs muſter for a Lieutenant to thoſe aforeſaid Champions, who have led the way before him in this enterpriſe. It is not unknown, how the *Papiſts* loaded the *Proteſtants*, at their appearing, and do ſtill at this day load them with ſuch kind of Charges; and to none is it more familiar to blame others for Hereſie, than thoſe who are greateſt Hereticks themſelves! 4. He ſaith, *In Doctrine, we trample generally upon the whole Moral Law, but more eſpecially upon the firſt Table:* And here very falſly he Charges our Doctrine to be contrary,

to

to the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth and ninth Commandments: but let us see now he maketh good his Charge in each of them. He alledgeth our Doctrine transgresseth the first Commandment, because we say, *All Prayer and Worship that is performed without the Spirit of God, is Will-worship and Superstition, and consequently no wicked or unregenerate persons are bound to Worship God, or indeed in any respect to obey God:* And from thence he concludes, *They are not under any Law of God; and therefore lastly, let them do what they will, they cannot sin against God, such men* (*in the* Quakers *Principles*, as he saith) *may deny, disown, reject, hate and contemn God, worship the Devil, and debauch at their pleasure; they may lawfully dishonour and defame all men, Murder, commit Adultery, Steal, bear false Witness, and yet they cannot sin, because they are under no Law.* Hence also he infers, *That Reprobates are most unjustly condemned for their sinning against God, seeing they* (*not having received the Spirit*) *are, not under Law to God, and so cannot be guilty of sinning against him.*

Now what Sober, Impartial and indifferent person that is not byassed with deep prejudice against us, seeth not, that these absurd consequences have not the least shadow of any Rational inference? For although we say indeed, that there is no true Worship, but that

which

which is in Spirit, according to the expreſs words of Chriſt; and that none are true Worſhippers of God, but ſuch as Worſhip him in the Spirit; and that God requireth no Liteleſs or Spiritleſs Worſhip; yet we ſtill affirm that all mankind ought to Worſhip God, and Call upon him, even all the wicked and unrenewed perſons, as well as the renewed; ſo that in the thing of Worſhip it ſelf, we have no Controverſy, whether it be due unto God by all mankind; but the ſtate of the Queſtion lyeth here betwixt us, and thoſe that diſſent from us; what the Worſhip of God is, and what kind or ſort of Worſhip it is that God requires of all men: And in Anſwer thereunto, we ſay, the true Worſhip of God is a Spiritual Worſhip, requiring the ſincerity of the heart not as a circumſtance, or accidental thing, but as the eſſential part thereof, which cannot be done without the Spirit of God: How much therefore more True and Rational conſequence is it to argue thus. God commands all men to Worſhip him, therefore he hath given ſome meaſure more or leſs of the help of his Spirit, unto all men, whereby they may ſo do, which doth continue with them ſo long as it pleaſeth God, who taketh away this help from none, but ſuch as mightily provoke him, and ſin out the day of their Viſitation. And even thoſe whom

the

the Lord in his Juſtice hath withdrawn that help or grace of his Spirit, are ſtill bound by the Law of God, to Worſhip him, as much as ever; even when they neither do, or can Worſhip him truly, becauſe they have brought this impotency or inability upon themſelves, by their own unfaithfulneſs; Even as a Servant or Steward that hath received a ſum of Money to pay his Maſter, and the ſaid Servant ſpendeth the Money upon his Lufts, and hath not one Penny, wherewith to pay the debt; yet he is ſtill lyable for the whole ſum. Hence what *J. A.* ſaith in *page* 11. of his Preface, is true, that the inability of unrenewed men, to perform acceptable Worſhip, neither does nor can take away their Obligation to perform it. But we differ from *J. A.* in the cauſe or reaſon, why thoſe who want that ability are ſtill under the ſaid Obligation; which reaſon he will have only and alone mens loſing it in *Adam*, in whom they all once had it; and the loſing of it is their fault, citing *Rom.* 5. 12, 19.

But to this I Anſwer, *Firſt*, Whatever loſs or inability is come upon *Adam's* poſterity by the primitive diſobedience; yet now by vertue of the ſecond *Adam* his obedience, a new ability is conferred upon all men; So that as broad as the Sore did ſpread by the firſt ſin, even

even as broad is the Plaister that God hath provided to the Lame and Diseased Souls of all mankind. And this is most clear and plain from *Rom.* 5. 18. as also from *Joh.* 3. 19. *And this is the condemnation* (said Christ) *that Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than Light, because their deeds were evil:* So we see, that Christ layeth not the ground of wicked mens condemnation upon *Adams* sin, but upon their hating the Light that did come unto them as a new and fresh discovery and visitation of Gods love. But secondly, Whether this Inability is come upon the wicked by reason of *Adam*'s sin, or by their own actual disobedience since that time; yet we affirm no less than *J. A.* that the most wicked and ungodly are still under the obligation to the whole Law of God; and their inability can be no ground of excuse unto them. But the true state of the Question is this, Whether wicked men, not simply as men, or creatures, but as wicked, and remaining still in their wickedness, should, or are required to offer up unto God hypocritical and lifeless performances of that which men commonly call Prayer and Worship; but is no more so in the sight of God, than a dead Picture of Stone or Clay is a true living man; and so whether God did ever require any to draw near to him with their Mouths, and remove

their Hearts far away, as the manner of all wicked persons, while so remaining, always is: Now we say, God never required such sort of Prayers, but refused and forbad them, to be offered unto him, even under the Law, see *Isaiah* 1. 13. *Bring no more vain Oblations*; and v. 12. *When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand to tread my Courts?* Again Psal. 50. 16, 17. *But unto the wicked, God saith, what hast thou to do to declare my Statutes, or that thou shouldest take my Covenant in thy mouth, seeing thou hatest instruction*, &c. And whereas *J. A.* citeth some words of our Friends, *That wicked men should not Pray*; let the Impartial and Indifferent Reader understand these words, in the Sense of those Scriptures just now mentioned, which are as positive and full, as any that can be cited out of our Friends Books, and all occasion of mistake shall be removed. For neither the Sense of the Scripture, nor of our Friends is, *That wicked men are bound in no respect to Worship God*; for the contrary is manifest from the words cited by *J. A.* out of the Book called, *The Principles of Truth*, where he alledgeth their words, saying, *All men ought first to wait, until they receive the Spirit in Truth, then in the same Truth to Worship God in Spirit who is a Spirit.* So we see by *J. A.* his own Confession, the *Quakers* teach that all

men

men ought to Worship God in the Spirit, and that they may indeed Worship him, they would have all men follow the Lords order, which is to wait, or watch unto Prayer; and they would have men in the first place cease or depart from their wickedness; and then by the help of the Spirit (which is never wanting in the proper season of it) to come and Pray unto God. And that this is no new or invented way of the *Quakers* so called; Read *Isaiah* 1. 16, 17, 18. where the Lord by the Prophet bids first, *That they wash and be clean, and put away the evil of their doings*, &c. And then said he, *Come now let us reason together*: Also *Peter* commanded *Simon Magus* to joyn Repentance with Prayer; *Repent* (said he) *and Pray, that the Thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee.* And for the more clear understanding of this whole matter, we are to consider, that Prayer is either simply Mental, and with the heart only, or both Mental and Vocal; to wit, both with heart and Mouth. Now as for Mental Prayer, at least in respect of the bent or frame and inclination of the Heart, God requireth it always of all men; and it is possible for all men, if they but receive that help of his Spirit, which he giveth or offereth unto men always to perform it. But as for Vocal Prayer, he neither doth require it at all times, nor doth he give the help at

all times, nor the utterance whereby to perform it. And it is observable, that under the Gospel, no particular set or limited time is appointed for Vocal Prayer: But every one is to wait to know the times of the Spirits call and moving thereunto, which will be seasonably and frequently afforded to such as wait singly therefore, especially when the people of God Assemble together; for then it is that Vocal Prayer is of greatest use and service, though it hath also its use and service in private, or when one is apart.

But whereas *J. A.* alledgeth further, *That if wicked men are not to Pray*, (*viz.* their Hypocritical Prayers) *because they sin when they Pray*; No man on earth should offer to Pray or Worship God, seeing as he saith, *There is somewhat of sin cleaving to the best Actions of the Saints here away.* To this I answer; That there is somewhat of sin cleaving to the best Actions of the Saints here away is denyed, seeing it is asserted by him without proof, for the Scriptures cited by him, *viz. Prov.* 20. 9. *Gal.* 5. 17. say no such thing, and by consequence he hath not evinced it; and for a proof to the contrary, see *Job* 16. 17. *Malach.* 1. 11. But secondly, nor doth it follow, that men, who are not yet come to a perfect state, but labour sincerely under the burden of their sins, to be delivered from them, may not

Pray

Pray unto God, becauſe their Prayer, as they put it up unto God by the help of his Spirit is pure and without all ſin, proceeding from the pure or renewed part of their hearts; for it is only the pure or renewed part of the heart, from which indeed the true Prayer doth proceed; even as on the contrary, the evil deſires and affections ariſe and ſpring only from the impure and unrenewed part. Therefore he that hath this unrenewed part in him, ought to watch againſt it, while he prayeth, that he give it no liberty to move or ſtir, as indeed he ought to watch againſt it at all other times. And though he that prayeth ſincerely, being not attained to a ſinleſs ſtate, pray not with that degree or meaſure of fervency, wherewith another more perfect doth or can pray; yet God regarding that mans ſincerity, he accepteth his Prayer, in Chriſt, and for Chriſts ſake pardoneth him, when at any time he committeth a weakneſs in his Prayer, in not keeping purely to the Spirit.

Again, *Laſtly*, Whereas *J. A.* objecteth, *That the Plowing, Eating, Sleeping, &c. of the wicked is ſin:* Shall the wicked then do nothing at all, becauſe whatever they do, they go about it in a ſinful manner. I anſwer, This conſequence doth no wiſe follow, becauſe there is a great difference betwixt a wicked mans Plowing, Eating, Drinking, *&c.* and

his Praying, as remaining wicked and alienated from the Spirit of God; for his Plowing, Eating, Drinking, or any other Corporal or Natural actions, are really these actions, and they are profitable and necessary in the Creation; and when he performeth these actions he faileth not in the substance or matter of the action required, but only in the manner; for the substance or matter of a wicked mans Plowing, Eating, Travelling, is not sin, but the manner of it, *viz.* That it is not in Faith, but a wicked mans Prayer, as he is a wicked man, is no true Prayer at all, it hath nothing of the true substance of true and real Prayer, it is a meer picture, or dead resemblance of Prayer; and is rather a mocking God, than praying unto him; for it wants the life of true Prayer, which alone the Spirit of God doth give; and thus a plain difference is demonstrated betwixt the two cases: and the Unvalidity of *J. A.* his consequences in this whole matter is evinced. And if the Reader desire further satisfaction, in this particular, let him Read our Answer to the Students, and *R. B.* his Apology, where these Objections of *J. A.* are largely Answered, for he has brought no new matter against us; and it had been better he had both spared his own pains, and not troubled the world with his repeating other mens Arguments, long since answered. As

for

for his inſtance of our oppoſing the ſecond Commandment, by our rejecting, wreſting and abuſing the Word of God, and avowing of Error and Blaſphemy; ſeeing it is but a bare alledging, without any ſhadow of proof; it is enough as ſimply to deny it, as he doth ſimply affirm it. But another inſtance he giveth of our oppoſing the ſecond Commandment, *By ſwallowing down our Meat and Drink (as ſo many Beaſts) without any Prayer and Thankſgiving; without which (if they will believe the Apoſtle,* 1 Tim. 4. 3, 4, 5.) *they are not ſanctified.* But how unjuſtly he chargeth this upon us, I can freely leave to the Judgment of all ſober and true Chriſtians. For how doth he prove that we Eat, or Drink, or receive any Creatures of God without Prayer and Thankſgivings? Becauſe we do not always uſe Vocal and External Prayer, when we Eat and Drink although at other times we uſe it, as God is pleaſed to give utterance, and are moſt glad either to do it, or joyn with theſe, who do it by the help of Gods Spirit: But is *J. A.* ſo ignorant and unreaſonable to think that theirs is no Prayer, or Thankſgiving, nor any uſe of the Word of God, but that which is Vocal and External: Do we not Read of the Prayer of the Heart in Scripture, and alſo of Singing and making Melody in the heart unto the Lord, as well as with the Mouth? Or

doth *J. A.* think that brutes can do this, as well as we, that he compares our Eating and Drinking altogether to that of Brutes. However for the ſatisfaction of thoſe that are ſober. I futher declare, that we hold it our duty, and I hope, we can ſay, it is our aim, and endeavour in all our Eating and Drinking, and in the receiving all the Mercies of God, both Spiritual and Temporal, to receive them with Prayer and Thanksgiving, either both Mental and Vocal; or at leaſt Mental, which we know is accepted of God, if in ſincerity when the Vocal is not uſed. And they who Pray, or ſeem to Pray with their Lips and Voices, when their Hearts are far away, as it is too much the general manner and cuſtom of people, their Eating and Drinking is worſe than that of Brutes, which ſin not when they Eat, as all wicked perſons do. But I ask *J. A.* doth he uſe Vocal and External Prayer and Thanksgiving, always when he receives any of the Creatures of God; as in the uſe of Tobacco, or Taſting a little Wine, or Ale, occaſionally in a Tavern; or when walking in an Orchard, is his Conſcience ſo ſcrupulous, that he cannot Taſte an Aple, but he muſt uſe Vocal Prayer: I ſuppoſe he is not ſo ſcrupulous. And doth not *J. A.* know, that there is not one moment of our Life, but we are full receiving the Creatures of God, ſeeing

every

every breathing or receiving in of the Air, is a renewed Mercy and Blessing of God, with many others continually added unto us: And yet the Lord doth not continually require Vocal Prayer, in the continual use of those Mercies. And here I shall propose a few plain Questions for *J. A.* to Answer, upon this whole matter. 1. Whether one that sincerely useth Prayer and Thanksgiving in his heart before he Eateth and Drinketh, and in his Eating and Drinking; and at all other times laboureth to have his heart exercised in the fear of God, although at times he use not Vocal Prayer, before and after Meat, is not more unlike to a Brute, and more indeed a true Christian; than he, who knoweth not what it is to fear God, or Pray to God sincerely in his heart, at any time, yet always at Meal-times useth a form of dead and lifeless words before and after Meat. 2. Whether to Pray without the Spirit and without sincerity of heart, be not a transgressing of the first, second and third Commandments. 3. Whether that Doctrine which teacheth men to Pray spiritless and hypocritical Prayers, doth not oppose these three Commandments. Further *J. A.* doth alledge, that we do openly impugne the fourth Commandment, in one of the following Queries, unto which place, he referreth the Controversy. To which I

Answer,

Answer, and so he might all the rest, without prepossessing his Reader with prejudice against us, until he had heard the whole matter more amply discussed.

Our opposing the fifth Commandment he instanceth; in not taking off our Hats, and bowing the body in Salutations: But seeing the fifth Commandment mentioneth no such form of Honour, nor doth he deduce it by any just consequence therefrom, It is as easily denyed by us, as affirmed by him. Nor doth it follow, as he alledgeth, that because we are to obey the fifth Commandment, with our Bodies, as well as with our Souls; that therefore we are to take off our Hats, in giving that honour to Parents; for the *Jews* to whom that command was particularly given, used no such form of honor or respect. And as for bowing the Body, although it was practised under the Law, yet we find it forbidden under the Gospel, as in the case of *Cornelius* bowing to *Peter*: And in the *New Testament* we read of no bowing that is lawful, but that which is at the Name of Jesus, and of God Almighty. Again, whereas he alledgeth, that from the words of Christ, *John* 5.44. *We Impugne the very letter of the fifth Commandment, and declare that no manner of Civil Reverence or regard is to be given to any man.* I Answer, this is a false Charge like unto

to the reſt; for we deny not, that there is a civil regard and honour that is due unto all men, in their reſpective degrees, which is alſo to be ſignified and practiſed with a ſuitable outward behaviour of the body, and may very well be, without either uncovering the Head, or bowing the Knee, ſuch as to riſe up before the Hoary-Head, or thoſe that are our Superiours; alſo to ſtand before them, to ſpeak humbly, or be ſilent, unleſs when required, or liberty is given; alſo to have an humble Aſpect, or regard of the Eye and Face towards them, to give the Hand, if required; to be ready at a beck to Anſwer their Call, and to walk and run to ſerve them, in what is requiſite; theſe and many ſuch inſtances of External Honour and reſpect, may Children lawfully practice to their Parents, and Inferiors to their Superiors, without either bowing the Knee, or taking off the Hat. But certainly theſe words of Chriſt, *Joh.* 5. 44. *Condemn all falſe honour which the ſpirit of the World hath invented:* And ſuch we have good cauſe to hold the uncovering of the Head to men, until *J. A.* can produce a better Original for it.

Laſtly, His inſtances of our oppoſing the ſixth and ninth Commandments; ſeeing they are but Allegations, I paſs them.

And

And thus I have gone through all that I ſaw requiſite in his Preface to anſwer, which may occaſion me to be the more brief in the things that follow, where moſt of the ſame things do again occurr.

CHAP. II.

AND here I give the Reader to know, that this pretended Examination of *J. A.* is in Anſwer to 17 Queries, which he ſaith came to him ſubſcribed by *J. S.* But I believe *J. S.* never did Subſcribe thoſe Queries, nor was he Author of them, but ſome of our Friends in *England*; however it is poſſible that through a miſtake, ſome had put the ſaid Letters unto them. And though *J. A.* ſeemeth not a little offended that theſe Queries ſhould be directed for one or all of the Miniſters in *Scotland* to Anſwer, as if ſuch a direction did argue both the Arrogance and weakneſs of the Authors; yet I do not believe that they all can Anſwer them ſufficiently, holding to Scripture, without renouncing their former Principles in great part. Far leſs is this pretended Examination of *J. A.* any ſufficient Anſwer unto them, as the ſequel I hope ſhall

make

make appear. In his Survey or Examination of the first Query, he alledgeth, *That the Questionist doth pervert the whole state of the Question, For,* saith he, *who ever heard that the Church of* Scotland, *or any other Church, made humane Arts and Sciences an Infallible Rule to make a Minister of Christ? then they should never have required more of any man in order to his admission to that Office, but his alone sufficient skill in* Grammar *and* Logick, *which the Adversaries themselves know to be most false.*

To this I Answer, That not the *Questionist* but *J. A.* doth pervert the state of the Question, for the Question was not, Whether *Grammar* and *Logick*, and the many Tongues, *&c.* was the only infallible Rule to make a Minister of Christ: but whether it was an infallible Rule, *&c.* Now that may be conceived to be an Infallible Rule, which is not the Infallible Rule. Nor doth *J. A.* his consequence follow, that then they should never have required more of any man in order to his admission to that Office, but his alone sufficient skill in *Grammar* and *Logick*, an example in other cases will show the weakness of this Consequence. It is reported that *Plato* made it an Infallible Rule to receive none into his School, but he who had some skill in *Geometry*, doth it therefore follow, that he required

no

no more of any man, in order to his admission, to be his Scholar, but that he had some skill in that Science. Another Instance may be this, in divers Incorporations and Cities it is an Infallible Rule, That none may be admitted to be a Magistrate in the said City or Incorporation, but he that is a Freeman therein, doth it therefore follow, that nothing is more required of any man in order to his being a Magistrate, but that he be a Freeman in that City? Now suppose the Church of *Scotland* make it not the one only Rule to make a Minister of Christ, that he hath *Grammar*, *Logick*, and the Languages, yet it may be very fairly Queried I hope, whether she makes it not an Infallible Rule? Seeing for many years by-gone she hath made no Ministers, but some as at least pretend to have *Grammar* and *Logick*, and *Languages*, and are called Masters of those Arts, (howbeit many of them have but a very small scantling of them for all the stress that seems to be laid on them.) And I Query whether it be not one of the Canons of the Church, that none be admitted into the Office of the Ministry but who have those aforesaid Arts? And if there be no infallible or absolute Rule or Canon in the case, then why do they not frequently allow men, wanting those Arts, who possibly may have all the other Qualifications re-

required, to enter into the Ministry. And it is further Queried, Whether *J. A.* or the Church that he doth own, doth establish and avow that Doctrine of *James Durhame*, positively asserted in his Commentary on the *Revelation*, that *Grammar Logick*, or the like acquired Arts, are necessary to the *esse* or being of a Minister of Christ, and consequently much more necessary than true Piety and Godliness, which he maketh only but necessary to his *bene esse* or better being, and only accidental to his being a Minister of Christ. And this Question, which is indeed the main design of the first Question, as is obvious to any ordinary understanding, *J. A.* for all his glorious pretence hath not in the least Answered, which is therefore returned upon him to be further considered.

And whereas *J. A.* saith, *That* Grammar *and* Logick *are ordinary means of Knowledge, exceedingly requisite in a Minister.* If by *Grammar* and *Logick* he mean not those innate gifts (which may be well called natural as common to all men having the ordinary use of understanding, and which I acknowledge to be in some degree necessary unto all) but the Systems of those Arts, as they are artificially composed of a great many Rules and Precepts, and commonly taught in the Schools. I ask *J. A.* Why are they more requisite in a Mi-

Minister, than in the rest of the Church? Ought not all the Church to have the knowledge of God, and of the Principles of Christian Religion as well as the Minister. And may not some of the people come to have as much true knowledge of God, as their Teachers; yea, may they not become wiser than their Teachers, as *David* said concerning himself? and whereby did *David* become wiser than his Teachers, was it by the humane Arts of *Grammar* and *Logick*? I trow not, but by the Law of God, wherein he did meditate both day and night. May not therefore people come to have as much knowledge of God at this day, without those aforesaid Arts, only by meditating in the said Law or Word, and praying to the Lord, as also waiting upon the Lord to have their understandings more and more opened, to understand the Scriptures, as *J. A.* hath, with all the help of his Arts? And if *J. A.* think that those Arts are necessary to attain Divine Knowledge, so as he who wants them, may not know as much of Divine things, as he who has them, I am not of his mind, nor I hope are many others in his Church, who believe they may both know the Lord, and daily grow in the knowledge of Him till they have as much, and perhaps more of true Divine Knowledge than *J. A.* ever had, without

out all *J. A.* his Arts, which he doth so highly magnifie.

But *J. A.* saith, *The Infallible rule to make a Minister of Christ, is set down in* 1 Tim. 3. *and* Tit. 1.

Answ. It is very well. But I cannot find in these places, or any where else in all the Scripture; that Artificial *Grammar* and *Logick*, are made any one part of that Infallible Rule, or that God hath any where appointed them, as ordinary means of attaining Divine knowledge. And if they be the ordinary means of Divine knowledge; then it must needs follow, that all who have the least measure of true Divine knowledge, have also humane Arts, or else they are extraordinarily taught; none of which I judge *J. A.* will readily grant. Now the Infallible rule set down by the Apostle, in these places already cited, requireth, *That Bishops and Deacons* (and consequently Ministers) *should be blameless, sober, just, holy, temperate:* And I Query *J. A.* if this one only qualification, *viz. To be Holy*, be as much made an Infallible rule, to make a Minister of Christ in the Church he owneth, as to have *Grammar*, and *Logick*, and *Tongues*: And how is this consistent with the foresaid Doctrine, that real Holiness is not necessary to the *esse* or being of a Minister of Christ? For is not that which is the infallible rule, to

make a Minister of Christ necessary to his very *esse* or being.

In the following part of his Examination of this first Query, *J. A.* doth further wrong the people called *Quakers*, *As if they did hold that* Grammar, Logick, *and* Languages, *were unlawful among Christians*: And upon this idle and false Supposition, he disputeth for the lawfulness of those Arts, which none of these people, so far as I know, deny: And for a proof to the contrary, that people have Schools wherein *Grammar*, and the *Languages*, viz. *Hebrew*, *Greek* and *Latin* are Taught, and some other Arts. Nor is it the use of the e things, but the abuse of them, and laying too great a stress upon them, that we oppose. Nor do we deny, but *Grammar*, *Logick*, and especially the knowledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Languages, may be of good use and service to him that is a Minister of Christ in a subordinate and subservient way, when he hath to do with men, especially that glory in these Arts, and in the abuse of them, contend against the Truth; such adversaries may be lawfully retorted from their own principles, and the points of their own weapons turned against them, as the Lord giveth freedom to do; although the simple naked Truth, out of the mouth of a man, having none of those Arts, has more prevailed against

against a Learn-learned Adversary many times, than many Learned men have done; whereof a famous instance is recorded to have befallen at the Council of *Nice*, where a simple Lay-man convinced again-saying Philosophers so called, when the Learned Bishops and Doctors could nothing prevail upon him; the which passage is at length recorded in *Lucas Osiander*, his *Epitome of the Church History*, Centur. 4.

But the said *J. A.* seemeth to dispute, not only for the lawfulness of *Grammar* and *Logick*, as they are Taught in Schools, but for the absolute necessity of them, to a Minister of Christ. For he saith, *Would they then have a Minister, not knowing how to Speak and Write Sense.* To which I Answer, And thinketh he that none in all the Church of *Scotland* knoweth how to Speak and Write Sense, but they who have Learned the Art of *Grammar*. I suppose there are many thousands in that Church, who never Learned any Art of *Grammar*, that have as good Sense, and can both Speak and Write to as good Sense; at least in their Mother Tongue, as *J. A.* and perhaps to better too, if that Proverb hold good, *That an Ounce of Mother-wit, is worth a Pound of Clergy.* And do we not commonly Learn to Speak and Write our Mother Tongue, without any Rules of *Grammar*;

and these who so Learn to Speak and Write, only by Reading and Hearing, without Rules of *Grammar*, speak well enough to be understood. And what great or intollerable defect is it, if a Minister of Christ, having sufficient knowledge and Piety requisite to that Office, should Speak or Write a little Incongruous *Grammar*; doth or should that Unminister him? Is not a blemish or error in Life and Conversation, much more intolerable; although such is the Vice of the Times, whereof some good men have formerly complained, that he who breaks a Rule of *Grammar*, is more noticed, than he who breaks the Rule of Piety.

Nor doth the Translation of the Scriptures out of *Hebrew* and *Greek*, argue the absolute necessity of those Languages, unto the Ministers of Christ; seeing men who are not Ministers, might have done that: And now since the Scriptures are Translated, (which we acknowledge is a great Blessing of God) the knowledge of these Languages seemeth less necessary on a general account; seeing whatever errors or weaknesses may be found in the present Translations, they contain the form of sound words, in respect of the more necessary things: And therefore the Scriptures thus Translated to him, who is indued with that Spirit that gave them forth, may well

enough suffice, though he hath neither *Hebrew* nor *Greek*: Which for all this pretended necessity, the far greatest part of those called Ministers in these three Nations have not so much skill of, but that they are as much obliged to the Translation as many others that make no such Vaunt. And it is a great question, for all this pretended necessity of *Hebrew* and *Greek*, whether many called Ministers in these three Nations, ever once in all their life Read an intire Chapter of the Bible in *Hebrew*, or indeed can so do: And I see no cause why there is any more absolute necessity for a Preacher to have *Hebrew* and *Greek*, than any ordinary true Christian; for if true Faith, Knowledge and Piety, can be attained as well without *Hebrew* and *Greek*, as with it, then why is it made absolutely necessary in the one, rather than in the other. Nor do we plead against the lawfulness or good use that may be made of Tongues: because they began at *Babel*, as *J. A.* doth alledge; but seeing they began at *Babel*, or *Babylon*, we may lawfully infer, they are not absolutely necessary to give the true knowledge of God, nor to make true Preachers, seeing there were men that did both truly know the Lord, and also Preached him in Truth, before the many Languages came in. Nor is *J. A.* his Argument

for the necessity of *School-Logick* less impertinent. *He that knows nothing* (saith he) *how to define, divide, judge and Argument aright* (*if any such were*) *is in no better capacity, than the Ass speaking to his Master: Take there* (saith he) *the* Quakers *Minister, very fit for* Balaam's *Sadle, if he had but four Legs. Ignorance I see is the Mother of the* Quakers *Devotion.* By this Argument *J. A.* (as it seemeth) concludes, that all men who want *School-Logick*, are no more men, and have no more the use of their Rational Faculties, to define, divide, judge and Argument aright, than *Balaam*'s Ass; and thus he puts many thousands, and ten thousands of his Fellow-Church-Members in the same List with *Balaam*'s Ass, and maketh them as unskilful to define, divide, judge and Argument aright, as *Balaam*'s Ass, only because they want *School-Logick*. And is this a Vindication of the Church of *Britain*, so to defame the greatest part of all her Members, by comparing them to *Balaam*'s Ass, only for want of *School-Logick*, which I suppose scarce the hundreth person has any knowledge of. Indeed I confess, it hath been but too familiar for such men, to repute the people as Asses, for want of those *School-Arts*; and they have but too much used them in times past as Asses, and also Rid upon them. But whether is not *J. A.* short of *Balaam*'s

Ass,

Ass, which saw the Angel of God, and had its mouth immediatly opened by the Lord to reprove the Prophet; to none of which *J. A.* hath any pretence. And why doth *J. A.* conclude, *That Ignorance is the Mother of the* Quakers *Devotion?* Because they have not commonly *School-Logick*, and judge it not absolutely necessary to any Christian, or Minister of Christ. Then by *J. A.* his Irronical and Sarcasme, none have true Devotion, but these who have *School-Logick*; the which reflection striketh as much against his own Church Members as us. And I suppose there are many thousands in the so called Church of *Scotland*, that may think *J. A.* deserves a sharp reproof, for such an idle Satyr, as to conclude, because we establish not *School-Logick* as necessary to Devotion; *That therefore Ignorance* (according to us) *is the Mother of Devotion.* When the *Protestants* blame the *Papists* for holding Ignorance to be the Mother of Devotion, I understand they mean the ignorance of the Scriptures, and principles of Religion, and not of *School-Logick*, which men may either have or want, and yet be truly Devout: And for all this scorn of *J. A.* I shall mind him of what *Augustine* observed above 12 hundred years ago, *Surgunt indocti, & indocta, & rapiunt cœlum à nobis doctis*: *The unlearned men*

and women arise and take the Kingdom from us who are the Learned: Which may well at least be applyed against them, who glory in their Artificial Learning, and set it up higher than it doth deserve. And said *Paul*, to the *Corinthians*, as well to the Preachers among them as others; *For ye see your Calling Brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh*, &c. *are called*. And what is a man with all his *School-Logick* and other Natural Sciences and Arts, but a wise man after the flesh: And yet according to *Paul*'s Doctrine, God had not chosen many such either to be Christians or Ministers. Moreover, whereas *J. A.* pleadeth for the great commendation of Humane Arts and Sciences of *Grammar*, *Logick*, &c. from *Isaiah* 50. 4. and 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. It remaineth for him to prove, that these places are to be understood of such kind of Learning, which I deny; and on the contrary affirm, it is Divine and Supernatural Learning, which is there to be understood. As to *Isaiah* 29. v. 12. 14. I grant that it is meant of humanly Learned; but it maketh clearly against him; seeing the Vision was a Sealed Book, as well to the Learned, as to the Unlearned: And therefore none of *J. A.* his Arts of *Grammar* and *Logick* could open the Seals here of.

Again

Again, whereas he saith, *The Quakers have often Objected to him against the lawfulness of Logick among Christians, because it was first used among Heathens*; and then he scoffingly doth inquire, *But what shall we do with the Isle of* Brittain, *which was first used by Heathens.*

Answer, that I suppose it is *J. A.* his mistake, or failure of memory, that the Quakers have ever Objected against the lawfulness of true Logick, which I know none to be against; only I judge it may be well argued, that seeing it was a thing used among the Heathens, and yet did not bring them to the true knowledge of God; nor can it bring any Christians thereunto now. And it seemeth unreasonable, that any Art found or used among the Heathens should be made an Infallible Rule to make a Minister of Christ. Or perhaps, if any of those called Quakers have Disputed against Logick, it hath been only against that falsly so called, *viz.* a Sophistical way of contending about any thing, for or against, which is too much used in Schools at this day, and wherein too many glory, and are puffed up. But *J. A.* his comparison betwixt the Isle of *Brittain* and School Logick is very unequal, else let him prove that his School-Logick is as necessary, and profitable to the life of man, as the Land of *Brittain* is.

Again,

Again, whereas in Answer to the Instances of *Elisha*, *Amos*, *Peter* and *John*, who were not bred up in *Grammar* and *Logick*, and yet were true Ministers, he alledgeth, *It is no good consequence to argue from an extraordinary fact to an ordinary fixed Rule*; I Answer, he hath not as yet proved that it is any ordinary fixed Rule by the Lord, that all must have those Arts of School-Logick and Grammar who are Ministers of Christ. He but here beggeth the Question, as it's ordinary for him to do in other cases. And as for us, we judge it no tempting of God, nor looking for extraordinaries to believe that we may receive true knowledge, and grow up in the same, so far as is requisite for a true Preacher to have, by our diligent reading and meditating on the Scriptures, by the help of God's Spirit assisting us to understand them, and withal using fervent Prayer unto God, to obtain the said help of His Spirit, although we neither use the Art of Grammar or Logick; and we find not that *Paul* recommended *Timothy* to give attendance to those Arts, but only to Reading, *viz.* the Scriptures, and not to neglect the gift that was in him, which I suppose *J. A.* will not be so rash as to say, was either Grammar or Logick. And now after diverse abuses and perversions of *J. A.* in his examination of this first Question, he concludeth with another

great

great calumny and false charge, in saying, *The Quakers alledge that Peter and John had no Grammar and Languages*, whereas the Question doth only alledge, *That Peter and John were not bred up in Grammar and Languages*, which doth not hinder it to be true, that God afterwards did immediately inspire them with the gift of Tongues. And yet even before they were inspired with these Tongues, they were Ministers.

In his Survey or Examination of the second Query, he continueth to play his old Game of perverting the state of the Question, which is not (as the Reader may see) whether Grammar, Logick, and Philosophy, *&c.* were extant in the World before Christ his coming in the Flesh, for that we readily acknowledge; but the Question is, *How long it was, after Christ, that those Arts were set up to make Ministers of Christ*; To this he gives no Reply, but only goeth on to prove the lawfulness of Philosophy, and to tell what it teacheth. Now, as for true and genuine Philosophy the Quakers deny it not to be lawful, even that commonly called Natural Philosophy, which is a knowledge of natural things, and the operations thereof, with their effects; but that which they oppose is to make such a natural knowledge, so far as it is only an Art taught in the Schools absolutely necessary to make a Minister

Minister of Christ. Again, *Secondly*, We Question much, Whether that which is commonly taught in Schools, among those called Christians, under the name of Philosophy, be indeed the true and genuine Natural Philosophy, seeing the far greatest part of it is exploded and rejected by not a few of the more knowing among your selves, and if any of us have called Philosophy, Foolosophy and Witchcraft, as *J. A.* alledgeth they did not mean it of any true Natural Knowledge, but in the Apostles sence, when he saith, *Beware lest any spoil you through Philosophy, and vain deceit*; which *J. A.* confesseth is Sophisticate and corrupt Philosophy. And dare he say there is none of that sophisticate and corrupt Philosophy taught in the Schools and Universities in *Brittain*. And may not sophisticate and corrupt Philosophy be called Witchcraft in that sence used by *Paul*, *Gal.* 3. *O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you.* And I Query what Philosophy doth *J. A.* mean by the true and genuine Philosophy, which he maketh so necessary to every Minister of Christ, whether *Aristotle*'s Philosophy, or the *Cartesian*, or any other, seeing there are many kinds of that called Philosophy in the World, whose principles and rules directly contradict one another. And the Schools in *Christendom* to this day have not agreed in the common prin-

principles and Rules of that called Philoſophy, but remain at great uncertainty in the very foundations of it, as is acknowledged, by the moſt ingenuous Profeſſors thereof. Now to make a thing ſo uncertain (as their Philoſophy is in many or moſt things, to wit, a fallible thing) an infallible Rule to make a Miniſter of the Infallible Truth, is a very abſurd and unreaſonable matter. But *J. A.* giveth us a number of Thirteen or Fourteen Poſitions, which his School-Philoſophy doth teach, the truth whereof is evident as that there is a God, who is Infinite, Eternal, Omniſcient, Omnipotent, Unchangeable; that every man is a Rational Creature; that the Soul of man is Immortal; that no Brute is a Man; that no Action can be without ſome Subject, nor without ſome effect; nor any Union without ſome extremes. But I ſuppoſe there are few men, if any that have but the right uſe of their underſtanding as men, that do not, or may not know all this without School-Philoſophy, as well as *J. A.* doth with it. And then what advantage giveth his Philoſophy unto him? But there are other great matters which his Philoſophy teacheth; and as he particularly deſcribeth them: they are theſe following, *That every thing either is, or is not; that nothing can both be, and not be at once; that of every contradiction the one part is true, and*

the

the other false; that every whole is more than its part; that every Cause is prior in nature to its effect; that nothing can work before it exist. But I must tell *J. A.* that these last mentioned Positions, are not taught by Philosophy, and are not any part of Philosophy, as is generally acknowledged by the Professors of it; because they are first Principles which Philosophy doth not undertake to teach, but presupposeth them as already known and understood, by the common dictates of understanding, that is in all men; and are called by them κοιναι ἐννοιαι common Sentiments or Principles; and therefore we still desiderate, what peculiar Misteries *J. A.* his Philosophy doth teach, that men of ordinary understanding doth not already know, or at least may know very easily by a simple reflection, without his Philosophy or School-Craft. Not that I deny, but that there are divers things which the true genuine Philosophy may teach, that are not obvious to common understanding; but I find nothing asserted by *J. A.* in all these positions, which he giveth as instances of what Philosophy teacheth, but every ordinary Tradesman knoweth as well to be true, as *J. A.* And therefore he might have spared his Pains in that idle and unnecessary work.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

J. A. in his Survey or Examination of the third Query, doth earnestly contend, *That the Words of the Scripture are, and ought to be called the Word of God:* For which he useth divers Arguments and Citations of Scripture; but the true state of the Question here, is, not whether the Scriptures figuratively, as by a *Synecdoche*, or *Metonymie*, may not be called the Word, for which I shall not contend, finding that the *Greek* Word *Logos*, Translated into *English* [*the Word*] is used sometimes in Scripture to signifie either Words or Writings, as *Acts* 1. 1. the Treatise Writ by *Luke*, he calleth it, τὸν πρῶτον λόγον, which is to say in *English*, the first Word or Speech: Also where *Paul* saith, *Our Gospel came unto you, not in Word only, but in Power*, &c. 1 *Thess*: 1. 5. And some other places may be found both in the *Old* and *New Testament* to that effect, which yet doth in nothing give to *J. A.* nor to any of our Adversaries, the least advantage against us. For the Question is, what is properly the Word of God, or the ὁ λόγος *viz.* That which is

most

most properly and eminently that Word of God, so much mentioned in the Scripture, with its wonderful effects; and that the Letter is not properly the Word of God, is as evidently apparent, as that the Writing or Written Letter of a mans Speech, is not properly the words of a mans Mouth; for we commonly distinguish betwixt a mans Word and his Write. How much more ought we to distinguish betwixt the outward Letter and Writing, and the Word of God in the proper sense, seeing God is an invisible Spirit, and so is his Word: And what he hath spoke by his Prophets or Apostles, he spoke it first in their Hearts and Mouths, before there was any Declaration of it in Writ; and consequently it was the Word of God, before the Writing: And therefore the Writing is not the Word properly, but only figuratively, as when a part is put for the whole, by a *Synecdoche*, or when the sign is put for the thing signified, as a Map of *England* and *Scotland*, is commonly called *England* and *Scotland*? and yet none will say, that that Map is really *England* or *Scotland*; or when we hear that *England* and *Scotland* produceth such and such Fruits, who is so ignorant as to think, that the Map or Card, produceth these Fruits, and not the Land it self. Let *J. A.* know therefore, that in all the places

where

where the Word is mentioned, he muſt prove that the Letter of the Scripture is meant, or he doth nothing againſt us; the which I am ſure he ſhall never be able to perform, ſeeing he grants himſelf, *That ſometimes at leaſt, by the Word is meant Chriſt, and not the Letter.* Moreover, I ask *J. A.* when he ſaith, *The Scripture is the Word of God*, what he meaneth by the term *Scripture* Doth he mean the only bare Writing, or Characters conſiſting of Ink and Paper; and will he ſay that is properly the Word of God? Or doth he mean the Doctrine expreſſed and ſignified by the ſaid Writing and Characters, and the true ſenſe and meaning of the Spirit of God held forth in the ſame, which *Metonymically* may be called the Scripture, putting the thing ſignified for the ſign (and thus the Doctrine may be called the Scripture, and the Scripture the Doctrine, to wit, by a twofold *Metonymie*, one where the thing ſignified is put for the ſign, the other where the ſign is put for the thing ſignified.)

Now we do moſt willingly grant that the Doctrine and true ſenſe or mind of the Spirit declared of or expreſſed in the Scripture, is, and may properly be called the Word of God. But then we further affirm, that the ſaid Doctrine or true ſenſe of the mind or Spirit, cannot be reached or attained unto by

the meer Reading or Hearing the Letter, o the bare meditating in the Letter; and therefore not every one that hath the Letter, Preacheth the Letter, and Heareth the Letter, hath alſo the true Doctrine and mind of the Spirit; and conſequently nor hath he the Word of God. But he only that receiveth the Spirit of Chriſt, or Chriſt the Lord who is that Spirit, receiveth the true Doctrine when he Readeth or Heareth the Scriptures, or meditateth in them, and conſequently he only receiveth the Word of God: And thus alſo none can Preach the true Doctrine and Word of God, but he who ſpeaketh it by the Spirit of God; and none Heareth the Word of God, but he who Heareth it, and into the Heart and inward Ears of his inward man receiveth it by the Spirit of God. To theſe only, I ſay, the Doctrine is known, and by theſe it is only received, as it is indeed the Word of God; and in this reſpect it was, that *Paul* commended ſuch as received the Truth, by the ſame Spirit by which it was Preached unto them through him; *That they received it not as the word of Man, but as the Word of God*, &c. Now this commendation can be given to no unbeliever, that what he receiveth in the Miniſtry of the true Servants of God, he receiveth it as the Word of God; for only the true Believers do ſo receive it, according to

Paul's

Paul's Teſtimony, as it is indeed the Word of God. Moreover, I would have the Reader to know, that when we ſay, by the Word, is underſtood Chriſt; we mean not Chriſt abſtractly, or ſeperately conſidered from the Divine Doctrine and Teſtimony of Life, whether in the heart or Mouth, that immediately proceedeth from him, nor yet as divided or ſeperated from any Divine operation of his Spirit, Power and Life in any of his Servants; but we take both theſe conjoyned together, to be the Word of God, even as the Soul and Body is one Man, and ſometimes the Soul is called the man, and ſometimes the Body, and both properly enough, when the Soul is in the Body and united therewith, but the Body alone without the Soul, is not properly called the man; and thus much I hope ſhall ſuffice, to ſatisfie the ſober Reader, as concerning the Word of God, how we underſtand it. Now whereas *J. A.* citeth divers places of Scripture to prove, *That by the Word of God is not underſtood Chriſt, but the outward Teſtimony or Writing of the Scriptures.* It is very evident, and may plainly appear ſo to be unto any having the leaſt meaſure of Spiritual underſtanding, that by the Word of God in theſe Scriptures, is not underſtood the Letter, but Chriſt, together with the Divine operation and Teſtimony

of his Life in the Hearts and Mouthes of his Servants. And among these places by him alledged, I shall cite these following (for it is needless to cite them all) *viz. Heb.* 4. 12. *Eph.* 6. 17. *Rev.* 1. 16. *Rev.* 2. 12, 16. *Rev.* 19. 15. And also he citeth divers Scriptures which mention the Word of Christ, and the Word which he hath spoken. And seeing that cannot be Christ himself, it must needs accaccording to him be the Letter. Now as to that Scripture *Heb.* 4. 12. *For the Word of God is quick and powerful*, &c. There are divers *Protestants* that expound it of Christ, and not of the Letter; and indeed the words themselves do plainly enough evince it, seeing it is said in the next verse, concerning the same Word, *That all things are bare and manifest to his sight*; and therefore that Word hath an Omniscience, which I suppose *J. A.* when he considers, will not affirm of the Letter of the Scripture. As for *Eph.* 6. 17. his reason is weak, that by it cannot be understood Christ, seeing it is called, *The Sword of the Spirit*; as to say, an Instrument in the hand of the Spirit. But this is only *J. A.* his gloss, and not *Paul*'s words; *For the Sword of the Spirit*, may very well be understood to be the Spirit it self, *As the shield of Faith*, *is Faith* that shield, *The Helmet of Hope*, is Hope that Helmet, so the City of *Rome*, is *Rome* that

that City; and why not also the *Sword of the Spirit*, that Spirit it self: And this is further confirmed out of the *Greek* Article, *Englished* by [which] that is in the *Neuter Gender*, and therefore rendring this Sense, *The Sword of the Spirit, which Spirit is the Word of God*, so that the Article [which] being in the *Neuter Gender*, is *Relative* to Spirit, which in the *Greek* Language is in the same *gender*. Again, as to those three places in the *Revelation*, which mention the Word of God; its being *the Sword of his Mouth, and proceeding out of the Mouth of Christ*: Doth *J. A.* think, that this only is the Letter of the Scripture? Doth nothing but the Letter come out of his Mouth? Doth not Spirit and Life, and living vertue come out of his Mouth? And did not Christ say, *The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and Life*, John 6. And is not this somewhat more than the Letter? But lastly, The Word of Christ, and the Word that Christ speaks, hath of the Life and Spirit of Christ in it; and therefore it is still somewhat beside the External Writing or Letter, and is not divided or seperated from Christ. And I have told *J. A.* already, that not only Christ abstractly considered, but the immediate Testimony and influence of his Life (which can never be seperated from him, no more than the *Sun* Beams can be seperated

from the Son) is alſo acknowledged by us to be the Word of God, and to be Light and Life.

But, ſaith *J. A. The whole Doctrine of the Prophets, is the Word of the Lord*; To which I Anſwer, I have granted, and do ſtill grant it ſo to be, but as is already ſaid, that Doctrine is not the bare Letter; nor hath every one that doctrine who hath the Letter; for to have the true doctine and ſence of the Spirit, is not only to have the Letter, but to have the Spirit, by which only the true doctrine can be conveyed unto us, although the true ſervice and uſe of the Letter, in ſubordination to the Spirit is not denied.

And whereas *J. A.* accuſeth the Quakers, *That they call the Scriptures a dead Letter*, I no where remember that ever I read or heard any of them ſimply calling it ſo. But only in ſo far as it is eventually ſuch unto them, who are ſpiritually dead themſelves, and are not turned to the quickning Spirit, but alienated therefrom, to ſuch only the Scripture is a dead and killing Letter, and this much divers Proteſtants have acknowledged as well as we, and particularly *John Owen*, in his Treatiſe on the Scriptures, *That it is ſo to the Jews, and other Unbelievers.* But unto all thoſe who are ſpiritually alive, the Scripture is no dead nor killing Letter, but a living Teſtimony; as alſo

alſo unto all ſuch whom it pleaſed God to quicken by his Spirit in the reading, or hearing or meditating in the Scriptures. Again that he ſaith, *A part of the Scripture, to wit, the Law conſidered, as ſtrictly legal is in reſpect of guilty ſinners called a killing Letter, but never the whole Scripture*; I Anſwer, That not only the Old Teſtament, but even the Writings or Letter of the New Teſtament, may be called a killing Letter to thoſe that remain alienated from the Spirit that quickens. Even as *Origen* hath formerly taught in his Commentary on *Leviticus*, *Not only* (ſaith he) *in the Old Teſtament is found the killing Letter; there is alſo in the New Teſtament the Letter which killeth him, who doth not ſpiritually attend unto the things which are ſpoken.* And why was the Law called a killing Letter? only becauſe it did curſe and condemn guilty ſinners. Nay, that is not the only or main reaſon, but rather that its Miniſtration could not give life, whereas the Miniſtration of the Goſpel, being accompanied with the Spirit, doth quicken and give life; and in that reſpect *Paul* ſaid, *The Law was weak, and could no make perfect*, and therefore calls it, *The Law of a carnal Commandment.* Now if any go from the Spirit, that only makes the true Goſpel Adminiſtration, and ſet up the Letter or Writings of the Apoſtles, in the room of the ſame. Theſe

Writings of the Apoſtles do eventually become a killing Letter, no leſs than that of the Law, and can no more give life, or make perfect, than the outward Law could.

And here upon this Head, I do readily take notice what *J. A.* acknowledgeth concerning the Scriptures in *page* 16. of his Book, towards the middle part, *viz*, *That the Scriptures as to the external Form and Mode, which they have from the Writers Pen, they are not the Word of God, but that as to their ennutiate doctrine and ſentence they are the Word of God.*

And why then doth *J. A.* make all this loud clamour and noiſe againſt the Quakers, ſeeing upon the matter he confeſſeth what they ſay, *viz. That the letter or external form of the Writing is not properly the Word of God.* And I ſuppoſe I may add with *J. A* his allowance, that the external Form and Mode of the Preachers mouth, when he formeth a ſound in ſpeaking Scripture Words, is not properly the Word of God any more than the bare writing, ſeeing there is no more in the one than in the other, ſimply as ſuch. Let not *J. A.* therefore blame us for that hereafter, which he confeſſeth himſelf; and we do as readily acknowledge, as he either doth or can do, *That the ennutiate and expreſſed Doctrine and ſenſe of the Spirit is indeed truly and properly the Word of God.* But then is

there

there no difference betwixt him and us? I Answer, as to the naming the Scriptures, the Word, it seemeth there is none. But yet another great Controversie ariseth, which I doubt will not be so soon ended betwixt us, *viz. Whether any man can reach unto that Enutiate Doctrine and sense of the Scriptures without the Spiritual Illumination and Assistance of that Spirit that gave them forth?* we say *Not*; and if he say *Yea*, we still differ; but not as it seemeth to me by his Confession, in naming the Scriptures, *The Word of God.*

But there is yet another great Charge wherewith he loadeth us in this his Survey of the Third Query, *Some Quakers*, saith he, *are upon this Head so grosly Atheistical, as to say, That the Scriptures are but the Saints Words and Testimony from their own particular experiences.* And again he alledgeth, *That according to the Quakers, they are but the meer bare Word of a Creature.* Hence he inferreth, *That the Pen-men of the Scriptures, of all men in the World, must have been the greatest Cheats and archest Impostors*, &c.

But seeing he produceth no expres Testimonies out of the Writings of that People, for such Assertions he is not to be believed. Nor doth it follow, that because the Scrip-

tures

ures are the Saints Words, that therefore they are not alſo the Words of God, even unto all who hear or read them; at leaſt mediately and remotely; although none but ſuch as believe, do receive them as ſuch, which yet is only and alone the fault of thoſe unbelieving perſons, becauſe they reject the Spirit of God that doth certifie or aſſure unto us, *That the Scriptures are proceeded from God by Divine Inſpiration.* And what if ſome have ſaid, *That the Scriptures are Teſtimonies of the Saints, from their experience.* May not this receive a fair and charitable conſtruction, and not preſently be judged to be groſs Atheiſm; for although the Scriptures give a narration of divers Hiſtories, as alſo of Precepts, Prohibitions, and myſteries of Faith, *As Chriſt His coming in the Fleſh; His being born of a Virgin; His being Crucified, and Buried; His Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion;* the which Hiſtories, and things aforementioned, albeit they cannot properly be called the *Saints Experiences*, yet the *Divine Inſpiration* and *Revelation*, which the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* had immediately of thoſe things, was truly their *Experience*; and let us ſee if *J. A.* will deny it; or if he do, may it not be more juſtly retorted upon him, *That he, and not the Quakers, deny that the Scriptures are from Divine Inſpiration*; or can he ſay, that although

though the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* had *Divine Inſpiration* and *Immediate Revelation*, yet they had no *Experience* of the ſame. And that we call the Scriptures, ſometimes, the *Saints Words* (yet not denying them in a true ſenſe to be the *Words of God*) *J. A.* can no more juſtly blame us than *Paul* and *John* who called their own Preaching and Writing, and that of their Brethren, the Witneſs and Teaching of men; ſo that *Paul* and the Apoſtles Words were both the words of men, and yet alſo the Words of God, to wit, mediately declared unto them by the Apoſtles. Now they whoſe Faith ſtood in the Power of God, received them, as the Words of God, but who came not to that power to believe in it, they were but unto ſuch as the words of men, which, as is already ſaid, was only and alone the fault of ſuch unbelieving Perſons.

There yet remains two parts or branches of the third Query, to which *J. A.* for all his pretended Survey, hath given no more ſatisfaction, than to any of the former. The firſt is, *Whether all that is written in the Scriptures, from* Geneſis *to* Revelation, *be a Rule of Faith and Manners.* To this he only anſwereth in general, *That we are bound to believe all Scripture Enunciation, from the beginning to the*

end

and (which we do readily grant, and that therefore it may well be called an Hiſtorical Rule of Faith) *and that the Moral Law, with whatſoever is of common equity, or whatever enjoyning any peice of Religious Worſhip under the* New Teſtament *doth belong to Chriſtians of our Calling and Condition; but that the obligation of the Ceremonial and Judicial Law is totally abrogated: And* (ſaith he) *the* Quakers *muſt be content with theſe generals.* To which I Anſwer, When the Nature of the Queſtion requireth a particular Anſwer, to Anſwer in general, neither can nor ought to ſatisfie; for notwithſtanding of all he hath ſaid, the great Queſtion yet remains unanſwered. What parts of the Scripture belong to the Moral Law, and what ro the Ceremonial and Judicial ſo called. Alſo ſeeing there are divers things that were commanded and practiſed by the Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians under the *New Teſtament*; whether all theſe do oblige us now, yea or nay; as for example, the Waſhing one anothets Feet, and Anointing the Sick with Oyl; and whether theſe actions were commanded by any part of the Ceremonial or Judicial Law, or whether they belong to any piece of Religious Worſhip under the *New Teſtament*. The other branch of the Queſtion is, *Whether every Title from Geneſis to the* Revelation *be the Word, or Words*

of

of God. To this he Answereth affirmatively, and seemeth, to be so offended with the Question, as if it did conclude, *That the* Quakers *judge, that the Scriptures are interpolated and corrupted with the additions of men.* But in Answer, *J. A.* ought to know, that to Query a thing, will not conclude that the Questionist doth positively affirm or deny what is Queried. Again, I hope it may without offence, not only be Queried, but also concluded, that the Translations of the Scripture (the which Translations are commonly called Scripture) have divers additions, which men have added, without any pretence to Divine Inspiration: The which Additions are commonly Printed in our *English* Bibles, in another Character than the other words. Now is it any Crime to ask if these Additions be the words of God, or only the words of man; and if such Additions be any part of the Rule of Faith and Manners? And yet those very Additions are of such consequence, that they may occasion the Reader to take up another sense of the Sentences, then otherwise he would, or perhaps the Spirit of God did really intend. Nor are there wanting divers, both Judicious and Learned men so accounted, and of good repute, even among *Protestants*, who do acknowledge, that some particular words have dropt in,

into

into the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Texts, ſince their firſt Writing, and what are theſe various Lections of many places of Scripture, eſpecially when they contradict in one and the ſame place? Are not ſome of them at leaſt only the words of men? All which being granted, yet do not hinder, but that the purity of the Scriptures is ſufficiently preſerved (*viz.* in reſpect of the main and neceſſary things) for which we have cauſe to bleſs God, and acknowledge his great care and Providence, as in many other things. And thus *J. A.* may ſee how much of the weightieſt part of his task, in giving a ſufficient Anſwer to thoſe Queries, he hath ſtill left undone, for all his windy Braggings againſt the people called *Quakers*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

IN his pretended Survey of the fourth Query, he divides it into three Sections: In the firſt, he laboureth by many Arguments to prove a thing, which we do not deny, to wit, *That the Scriptures are a Rule of Faith and Manners*: And ſo he might have ſpared himſelf and others, all that pains, for the ſtate of the Queſtion is not, whether the Scriptures are not, and may not be called a ſecondary Rule; nor whether they may not in reſpect of all the Hiſtorical part, be called an Hiſtorical Rule: But the true Queſtion is, whether the words of the Scripture, as they are only written and ſpoken outwardly, be the Principal, or only Rule of Faith and Manners.

Now ſeeing *J. A.* hath been at ſuch needleſs pains, to prove a thing againſt us, which we do not deny, I need not give a particular Anſwer to any of his Arguments. But becauſe there are divers of his Arguments, which have ſome falſe premiſſes, although the concluſion be granted; therefore I ſhall a little take notice of one or two of them.

In

In his ſeventh Argument, he maketh it one of the Premiſſes, *That the more ſure word of Prophecy, mentioned* 2 Pet. 1. 19, 20. *is the Scripture.* But this is denyed by us, for we believe it to be that Word of God in the heart, by which all the true Prophets did Prophecy, and without which we cannot underſtand their Prophecies, nor any other part of the Scripture. Now the reaſons of his Aſſertion are, 1. Becauſe of the coherence of 19 and 20 Verſes. But this is no ſufficient reaſon, for the coherence is as good and better, to underſtand it of the word in the heart, as to underſtand *Peter* ſaying thus, *Take heed to the Word of God in your hearts, by which the Prophets gave forth the Scriptures, for it is that ſame word, which maketh us ſure, that the Scriptures are Divinely Inſpired, and alſo doth give unto us the true Interpretation of them*: This is a good coherence and much better then that imagined by *J. A.* as if *Peter* had ſaid, *Take heed unto the Scripture, as the more ſure Word, for no Scripture is of any private interpretation:* The which violent and ſtrained coherence, I for my part cannot underſtand, ſeeing *Peter* aimeth at ſomething that is not the Scripture, as being neceſſary to give us its Interpretation: And what can that be, *But that Word of God, which ſpake in the Prophets.* His ſecond reaſon is, *That he cannot*

not understand how the Dictate or Light within is more sure, than Gods immediate voice from Heaven, as that was at the Transfiguration. To which I Answer, that the inward Voice or Word of God immediately in the heart, can very well be understood to be more sure as to us, than any outward Voice of God from Heaven. 1. Because that which is immediate in the Heart, is more near and immediate, than that which is outward in the Air, which cometh to the Heart and Soul, but mediately through the outward Hearing; however immediate may be understood otherwise. 2. It was by the immediate Word of God in the Heart, by which the Prophets, when at any time they heard an outward Voice or Word from God, did assuredly know that it came from God, and that it was no delusion of Satan. And they believed the Word of God in their Hearts, simply from its own self Evidence, and not from any borrowed Evidence of an outward Voice: For they oft believed, and received the Word of God in their Hearts immediately, when they heard no outward voice at all, as is generally acknowledged. And this inward or intellectual kind of speaking by the Lord unto the Prophets, is acknowledged by *Thomas Aquinas* and *Suarez*, and other Schoolmen, to be the most noble kind of Divine

Revelation, and consequently the most sure, at least unto us. His 3. Reason, *Is the Testimony of other Scriptures produced, and to be produced.* But he has neither produced, nor can produce any Scripture that proveth, that Word of Prophecy, or Prophetical Word, to be only the Letter of the Scripture, and not the Word or Light of God, and of Christ in the Heart.

Again in his eighth Argument, he alledgeth, *That it cannot be the Dictate or Light within, by which Spirits are to be tryed; because the Dictate or Light within is fallible:* And this he undertakes to prove, from some words of mine in *Quakerism no Popery*, where I acknowledge, *That it is possible for us to mistake and erre in Speaking and Writing (and consequently in Examining and Judging) if we be not duely watchful.* But how unreasonable this consequence is, I leave unto sober men to judge; as to conclude, because men are infallible, that therefore the Dictate and Light of Gods Spirit in men is fallible also. Was not *Peter* fallible in some Cases; *Yea*, did he not fall sorely, when he denyed his Master: Doth it therefore follow, that the Dictate or Light of Gods Spirit in him was fallible; Indeed if I had said, that when we follow the Dictate and Light of God within, we are fallible, he might have inferred such a consequence;

but

but I never said, nor thought any such thing, but on the contrary, that the Dictates and Leadings of Gods Spirit in us are infallible, and have a direct tendency to lead, guide and move us infallibly, as they are purely kept unto, the which is possible for us to do. Another Argument he bringeth against the Dictate within; *It's being the rule to try Spirits, because then it would be both Superior and Inferior, which is Repugnant, Superior, when it tryes and examines; and Inferior, when it is tryed and examined.* To which I Answer, 1. It is no Repugnancy, that one and the same thing be Superior and Inferior in different respects, and as it respecteth different Subjects. But 2. There is no necessity to understand the Dictate and Light of Gods Spirit in divers men to be Superior and Inferior, when it examines, and is examined, for one equal may be a measure or rule to another; yea one thing may be said to be a rule unto it self, according unto that common Maxim or principle, *Linea recta est norma sui & obliqui*, i. e. *A right line is the rule of it self, and also of that which is crooked.* Otherwise let *J. A.* Answer me, *How did* Adam *know the voice of God in his Heart and the Prophets, before the Scriptures were writ, how did they know it?*

And in the close of his first Section, he concludeth with a manifest Untruth, *That the*

Quakers *are for a new Dispensation, not only in manner, but matter, contrary to the Doctrine formerly Dictated by the Holy Ghost.* This I say is false, which he neither doth, nor can prove, and the Dispensation we plead for is the same, both for matter and manner, which belonged to all true and good Christians in all Ages. And as to what he saith, *Of our extream Infatuation and Brain-sickness, and retaining the proportion and features of humane bodies, having quite enervated our Rational Essence.* These and the like scoffing and disdainful expressions are no more to be regarded by us, nor have any more weight, than when some *Epicureans* at *Athens*, called *Paul a Babler* We know, it hath been the Lot of Gods people in former Generations, to be reputed by Adversaries, both Fools and Mad-men. However, we hope, the sober Readers of our Books and Treatises, and these also who have any Converse with us, will find that we have neither abandoned, nor lost the use of our Rational Faculties, which we acknowledge to be good Gifts of God, and for which he is to be praised; nor doth our principle and belief of Divine Inspiration, as being a more noble and excellent Gift of God, than the highest Natural Faculty of Reason, either weaken or render useless to us our Reason, but doth indeed both strengthen it and make it the more useful and com-

comfortable, whereof to Gods praiſe, we are bold to ſay, we have true experience, notwithſtanding of what *J. A.* or any of his inſulting humour do, or can ſay to the contrary.

There yet remains two other things in this firſt Section of *J. A.* which I think fit to notice. One is, *That he alledgeth ſome of us underſtand by the more ſure word of Prophecy, the Scripture, which is only to be taken heed unto, until the day dawn, and the day Star ariſe in the heart; that is, until the Holy Ghoſt be given, and that conſequently, the Scriptures ſerve for nothing to believers, who are born with the Spirit and ſealed therewith.* But ſeeing he has produced no Names of any among us underſtanding that more ſure word of Prophecy to be the Scripture, we are not concerned to Anſwer him. It is poſſible that ſome in Diſcourſe, has only ſo argued with him, *ad hominem*, as they uſe to ſay, and not as being their own judgment. And as for the Scriptures, we judge that they are profitable, and ought to be Read by true Believers and renewed perſons, as well as others. But when doth *J. A.* think that the day dawneth, and the day Star ariſeth in the hearts of believers? Whether in this mortal State, Yea or Nay, and then whether the ſhining of Gods day, and the day Star thereof, be not a true immediate Revelation in the hearts of thoſe who have it, and

whether it doth not more assure them who have it, than the Letter of Scripture can do? And seeing the Light of God in them, when it shines in the heart but as in a dark place, is a more sure Word, than an audible voice from Heaven, or than the Letter of the Scripture, as to us; what shall be said of that Light, when it becometh not only as the day Star, but as the day it self, for clearness in the Soul? Or can there be any greater, or more principal rule than this? The other thing I notice is, *That he inferreth the Scriptures to be a rule*, because Christ said to the *Sadduces*, *Ye erre not knowing the Scriptures*. Now if this Argument hold good, seeing Christ said also, *Ye erre not knowing the Scriptures, nor the Power of God*; It will as well follow, *That the Power of God*, is the Rule, and that the rather, because it was their being ignorant of the Power of God, (which quickens both Soul and Body) that made them ignorant of the Scriptures; for none know truly the Scriptures, but they who know the Power of God; and therefore that Power, which is Life, Light and Spirit, is the more principal and original rule. But *J. A.* in citing these words of Christ, omitted the following words, which are exceeding weighty, *viz.* [*nor the Power of God,*] whether this was purposely done of him, to ensnare his unwary Reader,

Reader, or not, I shall not determine; but leave to his consideration.

CHAP. V.

J. *A.* in the beginning of his second Section, concerning the Rule, is pleased to call me an *Arab-Quaker*, (the which Title I no wise acknowledge) *and a man too Learned, as I employ it.* To which I Answer, That as to my Learning, that is but very ordinary, and a thing I neither can nor ought to glory in. However in this I rejoyce, that the Testimony of my Conscience beareth me Witness in the Holy Spirit, that any small measure I have of that called Learning, it hath been my sincere aim and endeavour to employ it to Gods Honour, and serve the Truth therewith, and not in the least to use it against the Truth, so far as it was, or is made manifest unto me. Next, he blames me that I affirm, *The Scriptures are only but a secondary Rule of Faith and Manners; but that the Spirit, or his Dictate within, is the Principal Rule, and like* Proteus, *turning my self into all shapes; sometimes I design Christ himself, oftner the Spirit himself, but oftnest the Dictate of the Spirit within to be*

that Rule. But he might at that rate have no leſs blamed the Apoſtle *Paul* that he turned himſelf into all ſhapes, while he affirmeth ſometimes, *That Chriſt ſpoke in him; and ſometimes that the Spirit ſpoke in him*; and certainly what Chriſt or the Spirit ſpoke in him, was by a certain Word or dictate. But to Anſwer directly, when I ſay Chriſt is the Rule: And again, when I ſay the Spirit is the Rule, there is no abſurdneſs therein; for if we mean by the Spirit, the Holy Ghoſt, Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt are never ſeparated or divided in what they Speak or Witneſs in the ſouls of men, but their ſpeech and Teſtimony is one and the ſame alwaies; and alſo Chriſt himſelf in Scripture is called *the ſecond Adam*; *the quickening Spirit, and the Lord that Spirit*; and ſaid Chriſt, *I am the way, the Truth, and the Life*; and certainly that Life is Spirit; and alſo the Words or dictate of it is Spirit and Life, as Chriſt ſaid, *The words that I ſpeak unto you are Spirit and Life.* So the Reader may ſee that my words are ſound and according to Scripture, and therefore whether I ſay, Chriſt or the Spirit, or the internal dictate and Word of the Spirit is the Rule, it is to the ſame purpoſe. And to ſay the dictate of the Spirit is the Rule, is no other than to ſay, the Spirit dictating or ſpeaking is that Rule; and do not

ſome

some of your selves use a variety of Speech, when ye speak of the Rule, one time saying, *The Scripture is the Rule*; another time, *The Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament is the only Rule*, &c. as the *Westminster* Confession of Faith expressly hath it. Another time, *The Spirit of God speaking in the Scriptures*, &c. Now according to *J. A.* I may blame him and his Brethren in this case, that *Proteus* like, he and his Brethren turn themselves into all shapes when they speak of the Rule. And whether these phrases used by them be not more unscriptural, I leave unto sober men for to judge.

In the next place he argueth, *That Christ cannot be the Rule, nor the Spirit, because the Rule of Faith must be some complex Proposition, Direction, or Precept, and the like.* To this I Answer, *First*, That the Rule of Faith must be a complex Proposition, Direction, or Precept, formally understood in words formally conceived, I altogether deny, and *J. A.* hath not offered to prove it. And although the Spirit of Christ may, and often doth speak express words in the souls of his people, yet he doth not alwaies so do, when yet he clearly enough signifieth his mind and will unto them; for if among men, a King may signifie his mind to his Subjects, or a Master to his

servants,

servants, without any formal Proposition, or direction of words, but only by some motion of his hand or face: How much more may the Lord God, who is the King of Kings, signifie his mind unto his servants by the motion of his Spirit, without any formal or expres words? Again I ask *J. A.* if he hath not learned in the Schools, that the reasonable nature of God is the first rule of Manners? And certainly the reasonable Nature of God is not a complex Proposition consisting of many words. And hath he not read in *Boetius* that excellent saying? *Quis legem det amantibus? major lex amor est ipse sibi*, which the Author of a late Book called, *The Life of God in the soul of man*, doth use, to prove that somewhat more than words is a Law or Rule to Christians, and Englisheth thus:

For who shall give a Law to them that Love?
Love's a more powerful Law that doth such persons move.

And I further Query *J. A.* seeing the Scripture saith, *God is Love*; he that knoweth God to be Love, and hath the Love of God shed abroad in his Heart by the holy Spirit, which in Scripture is called, *The Spirit of Love*; shall not this man be tyed to love God, and his Brethren; yea, and all mankind, even his very

very enemies. Suppose it be not said to him in formal expreſs words, do ſo and ſo. Again, whether he that only readeth or heareth thefe outwardly, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c. and thy Neighbour as thy ſelf*; but his Heart is utterly void of the love of God; or he that hath the love of God in his heart, and feeleth the powerful conſtraint of it, is under the moſt powerful Law? Whether the words without, or the Spirit and Nature of Divine Love within, is the moſt powerful Law and Rule? There may therefore be a Law or Rule, which is not a complex Propoſition of words, either inward or outward, to wit, the Divine Love it ſelf, which hath a Voice and Language to the ſouls of men, in the ſilence of all words, many times, and can be underſtood as well without words as with them. And therefore when I ſay the dictate of the Spirit is the Rule, I mean not, that there is alwaies a dictate of expreſs words, but that which is either ſuch a formal expreſs dictate, or equivalent thereunto, which thoſe who are acquainted with the experiences of the Saints do well underſtand, although it may ſeem to *J. A.* a ſtrange Riddle or Paradox. And thus by what I have ſaid in this particular, the intelligent Reader, I hope, ſhall perceive, that in ſaying, *The Spirit is the Rule*, I am not beſide my ſelf, as *J. A.* doth alledge,

but

but speak the words of Truth, and soberness. And I further ask, Whether *J. A.* thinks that *Ignatius* the Martyr was beside himself, when he writ in one of his Epistles to the People, χρῶνῶ χρωμενοῦς τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, i. e. *Using the Holy Ghost for a Rule?* or, Whether *Paul* was beside himself when he said, *The Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus had made him free from the law of Sin and Death.* And whether that Law was not the Spirit of Life, even as the Law of sin, was sin; and the Law of death, was death. And whether the Law of the Mind, mentioned by *Paul*, was not a Divine Principle of Grace in his mind, even as the Law of his Members was a principle of sin and corruption, that sometime had place in him, and not any complex Proposition of words? And whether the Law that God writeth in the hearts of his people in the new Covenant, be simply a form of words, consisting of so many letters, syllables and sentences; or, rather to speak properly is not that Law, a new and Divine Nature or substantial Life of Holiness and Righteousness and Wisdom, by which the Children of God are led and taught under the new Covenant (naturally as it were) to love God, and all men; even as the Law that God hath put in all living Creatures, or Animals to love and cherish their Off-spring (which is a shadow or figure of that more Divine

vine Law in God's people) is not any compleat Propoſition of words, but an innate principle of love and affection, which he hath planted in them?

Moreover, the ſaid *J. A.* digreſſeth here from his matter to ſeek an occaſion againſt us, and to load us with down-right Blaſphemy, becauſe we do not ſay, that there are three Perſons in the God-head. But to this Charge I have anſwered already to one of *J. A.* his Champions, in my book called, *The Way Caſt Up*; the which hath given content to divers ſober people, and I hope may give content to all who reads it in that particular, where I ſhow, that it is only the unſcriptural terms of a Trinity of Perſons, or of three Perſons in the Godhead, that we deny, and not the myſterie or thing it ſelf, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, being three that bear Record in Heaven, which according to the Scripture, we both believe and confeſs. And indeed *Auguſtine* in his Fifth and Seventh Books of the Trinity, not only ſaith the words, *three Perſons* are improper, but diſputeth againſt them; and I ſuppoſe *J. A.* for all his School-Logick and Philoſophy, ſhall hardly be able to Anſwer his Argument, the ſubſtance of which, to my beſt remembrance, is this, *The word Perſon, either it ſignifieth ſomewhat abſolute and ſimple, or ſomewhat relative; to ſay the firſt is abſurd; otherwiſe there ſhould be three*

ab-

absolute Beings, or Essences in God, which is absurd, if somewhat relative (which is the second) then seeing every relative is referred, or is relative to another, as Father is relative to Son (and therefore Father is the Father of another, and no man is his own Father) in this sense, to say the Father is a Person, is to say, the Father is the Person of some other, and so of the rest, which is absurd. The which Argument, not as mine, but really *Augustines*, I leave *J. A.* to Answer; and *Jerome*, another ancient Doctor and Father so called, doth find fault with the words, *Three Hypostasis*, saying expressly in the words, *Three Hypostasis, Latet aliquid veneni, There lieth hid some poyson.* And *Laurentius Valla*, a man well esteemed among the learned, findeth fault with the words, *Three Persons*, why then should we be so uncharitably charged by *J. A.* or such hot-headed men, with Blasphemy, only for keeping close to Scripture words in so great a Mysterie, while the thing it self, so far as the Scripture declareth it, is owned by us. And whereas he urgeth us to tell what Three are they to be called, if neither *Three Gods*, nor *Three Persons*, I Answer, It sufficeth us to call them, what the Spirit of God in Christ and the Apostles hath called them; and to enquire no further, nor to be curiously wise, above what they have declared. Hath not *J. A.* heard,

That

That there is a *Docta Ignorantia*, or *Learned Ignorance*, which is more safe, and to be preferred, to an uncertain Knowledge or Science falsly so called. And if *J. A.* his definition of *Person* be received, *viz. That it is an intelligent Being, subsisting incommunicably or distinctly one from another.* I see not, for my part, but that *Three Persons*, at this rate, shall infer three intelligent Beings subsisting incommunicably, and consequently *Three Gods.*

Lastly, That he saith, *Some Quakers have called them three Manifestations*, viz. *of* Moses, *of* Christ, *and of the* Spirit; he ought to have produced their names, or then we are not bound to believe him, that any have said so; for, at this rate, *Moses* should be the Father of Christ, which I do not believe any, called a Quaker, ever thought; perhaps some have said, there have been three Dispensations or Manifestations of God, one through *Moses*, and one through Christ in the Flesh, and one through the Spirit, or Christ in Spirit; and that these may after some sort have such a reference, as that the first may be called relative to the Father, yet not excluding the Son; and the second may be relative to the Son, not excluding the Father, *&c.* which yet doth not argue, that we understand the Dispensation, or Administration of the Father, to be the Father himself; far less *Moses* to be the Father, as *J. A.*

I be-

I believe very rashly and unwarrantably doth alledge, Now that there are or have been diversity of Administrations, the Scripture is plain, and *Protestants* as well as *Papists* do acknowledge it. Yea, what saith *J. A.* to the common Catechism that saith, *The Father hath Created us, the Son hath Redeemed us, and the Holy Ghost hath Sanctified us*; which is to be understood not exclusively, nor yet without some order in the manner of working. But who will be so foolish or ignorant, for all this to say, *That the Father is our Creation, the Son our Redemption* (strictly or literally, and without a Figure so understood) *and the Holy Ghost our Sanctification.* Nor doth it follow, that because Christ bringeth in his Father and himself as two Witnesses, to prove that he was the true *Messiah*; that therefore there are either two or three Persons in the Godhead; for Christ speaketh these words, not simply as God, but as man: Now as Man, we acknowledge that Christ is a distinct Nature or Being from God, although not divided or separated therefrom. And lastly, that he argueth, *That Christ is called the express Image of the Fathers Hypostasis, and that Hypostasis should be and is truly Translated* Person, *and not* Substance, *and otherwise it would infer* Arianism. I Answer, That *Hypostasis* should be Translated *Person*, he doth meerly affirm without any

any proof from approved Authors, and ſure I am the Etymologie of the word, hath no affinity to perſon, but properly ſignifieth *Subſtance*, being compounded of the *Preposition*, and *Subſtantive* Verb, which as near as poſſible, is in Latin *ſubſtantia*, and in Engliſh *ſubſtance*, and is ſo Tranſlated, *Heb.* 11. 1. Now that to Tranſlate it *ſubſtance*, would infer *Arrianiſm*, *J. A.* doth but meerly ſay it without any proof, and ſo is not to be believed, And beſide, Chriſt in Scripture is called, *The Image of the Inviſible God*; and certainly God is a ſubſtance, and yet this, I hope, will not infer *Arrianiſm*, and may we not well underſtand how Chriſt as man is the Character or Image of God's ſubſtance, without *Arrianiſm*, ſeeing Chriſt ſaid, *viz.* in reſpect of his Manhood, *My Father is greater than I*; and it is clear that the aforeſaid place, *Heb.* 1.2,3. is to be underſtood of Chriſt, not ſimply as God, but as man, who certainly as man is the moſt bright and glorious Image of God, and above all Angels or Men, or whatever can be named beſides the Godhead it ſelf.

CHAP. VI.

HAving thus traced *J. A.* in his unnecessary and impertinent digression, I shall now reply unto his Arguments, whereby he laboureth to prove, that the Scriptures are the principal rule of Faith and manners.

And to the first, that in *Isaiah* 8. 10. they were sent unto the Law and Testimony, supposing that were the Scriptures, it followeth not, that therefore it is the principal rule, especially in Gospel times, when God writeth his Law in the heart, and the Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy; and he that believeth hath the Testimony or Witness in himself. But that people are not sent to any dictate, Word or Light within, as *J. A.* doth alledge is false, and contrary to 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. *Deut.* 30. 14. *Rom.* 10. 8. *Joh.* 3. 20, 21. *Joh.* 12. 36. And doth not God and Christ, and the Holy Ghost dwell in the Hearts of believers; and must not they go to God and Christ, where they are, and doth not God and Christ speak in his people? Are they not his Temple, and as God spoke immediately in the outward Temple, under the Old Covenant;

venant; the which Temple was a Figure of Christ and the Church, shall he not speak now immediately in his true Temple, as well as he did in former times: Or are we wholly to neglect God and Christ in us, and their Inward Teaching; and only to mind the Letter of the Scripture without us, according to *J. A.* And when *Paul* said to *Timothy*, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee*, Hath this command no regard unto us. And when Christ saith, *Behold I stand at the door and knock, if any man will hear my voice*; Is this door only an outward door, or is not rather the door of the Heart, which is inward; and therefore is not that voice inward? And whence is it, that seeing Christ is so near to his people as to be in them, that he doth not speak one word to them by himself, as a man doth to his Friend, that he is present with: Is it want of power or unkindness, that he doth so refrain. Doth not *J. A.* and those of his Principle, *make God over all Blessed for ever more*; like unto the dumb Idols mentioned in the Scripture, *Who have a Mouth but speak not*, being always dumb or silent. Oh! what an Indignity is this to the Lord of Glory; and let *J. A.* take heed, lest he who is so ready to charge us with Blasphemy, be not found among the Blasphemers himself, who would limit the Lord from speaking and revealing himself, in his Living Temples.

To his ſecond Argument I Anſwer; Though the Scriptures are Infallible, and cannot deceive us; yet they cannot ſufficiently demonſtrate unto us, their Infallibility, nor yet their true Senſe, without the evidence of the Spirit, as is clear by *Paul*'s Teſtimony, 1 *Cor.* 2. 4. where he telleth, *That his Speech and Preaching was in Demonſtration of the Spirit and Power*; And therefore without that demonſtration of the Spirit, his words could not prevail, nor perſwade them, that they were of God: And certainly if *Paul*'s Preaching needed the demonſtration of the Spirit, his Writing doth as much need it at this day.

To the third, I ſay, It is no derogating from the Scripture, that they derive their Authority from the Spirit of God, which gave them their being, even as it is no derogation from the words of a King, long ago ſpoken by him, *That he confirmeth them a new, by a new immediate Teſtimony.*

To the fourth, Although we may not receive any Dictate within, that agrees not with the Scripture; it doth not follow, that therefore the Scripture is above the Spirit of God, or his Dictate; for as the Spirit can never contradict the Scripture, ſo nor can the Scripture ever contradict the Spirit of God; and neither can the Spirit or Scripture, ever

con-

contradict pure and ſound Reaſon; yet it doth not follow, that Reaſon is either greater, or equal to the Spirit, or to Scripture. And becauſe that Dictate which is contrary to Scripture is to be rejected, as being none of Gods Spirit, it doth only well follow, that the Scripture is a Rule, that is to be ſet over all falſe Dictates, to judge and condemn them, which we moſt willingly grant.

Now *J. A.* perceiving that I could retort one of his Arguments, labours to guard againſt it, *As ſeeing the Word of God is the principal Rule, and the Dictate or Speech of Gods Spirit within men, is the word of God; therefore that Dictate is the principal Rule*: And this Argument I did uſe in my Book called, *Quakeriſm no Pepery*. To which he Anſwers by denying, *That there is any ſuch Dictate of God, or the ſpirit in any men whomſoever, whether believers or unbelievers*. But to this I Anſwer, 1. He will not deny, but that the Apoſtles had ſuch an inward or immediate Dictate, and alſo the Prophets; and therefore he muſt allow, that the Scripture, as to the Prophets and Apoſtles, was but a ſecondary Rule, or at leaſt no greater Rule, than that Dictate within, which they had. And yet by *J. A.* his *Logick*, the Apoſtles did vilifie and deſpiſe the Scriptures, and it was a needleſs or unuſeful thing unto them, ſeeing they had an inward

Dictate, which was greater, or at least equa unto the Scripture: Or let *J. A.* shew, how their having the Inward Dictate for their Rule, did not make them undervalue the Scriptures; whereas our having such a Dictate as he alledgeth, or pretending to such a Dictate makes us so to undervalue them. But secondly, he only supposeth it, without any proof, that such an Inward Dictate, which was once in the Church of God, (as is confessed,) is discontinued, or ceased. And this indeed is the general manner of our opposers, who lay it down as a Principle, as needing no proof, that Immediate Revelation, and Teaching of Gods Spirit is ceased. But let *J. A.* know, that we can receive no such Doctrine as a Principle from hims but return it as a meer idle and false supposition, which yet is the foundation of a great many of his consequences against us. Thirdly, that he saith, *I should first prove, that there is such a Dictate in every man.* I Answer, that I have done already, in my Book called, *Immediate Revelation*, published many years ago, by many Arguments; and he should first have Answered to these, before he had sought any more: Also in my Book called, *Quakerism no Popery*, to which he has given no sufficient reply, and some of the most weighty, he hath not so much as once Named. And whereas

whereas he objecteth the *Americans*, and others that cannot tell how many Gods there are: I ask him, by what shall the *Americans* be judged at the last day; shall it not be by the Law of God, writ in their Hearts. And do not these *Americans* sin against God, and those also who are most ignorant, and yet want the Scripture; now where no Law is, there is no transgression. This I hope is enough to prove, that even the *Americans*, and consequently all men, have a Divine Law in their Hearts; for if it were not Divine, and as really the Law of God, as any that we have, to transgress it, were not a sin against God. Hence I thus argue, a Divine Law in all men, is an Inward immediate Dictate; but there is a Divine Law in all men, and therefore, *&c.* And in this respect it is, that the substance of the Moral Law is generally acknowledged to be Imprinted in the Hearts of all men, even those who want the Scriptures. And I well remember, that Bishop *Sanderson* saith in one of his Sermons, *That the said Law, in the Hearts of all men, is as really the Word of God, as that Printed in our Bibles:* And thus I hope I have sufficiently evinced, that there is a Dictate in all men, that is a Divine Law and Rule, at least in many or most things, belonging both to Piety, Justice, and Sobriety. Although I

do not plead, that there is a Law or Rule in them, who have not had the History of the Gospel revealed unto them to believe the same. Nor do I say, that the History of the Gospel is revealed to us immediately without the Scripture; but that, having Heard or Read the said History, and all other Historical parts of the Scripture, the Spirit of God, by some Inward Dictate formal or virtual, or that which is equivalent, doth move and incline us to believe the same. And that *J. A.* doth plead, *That Believers only have the Spirit.* I Answer, They have it only so as to possess and enjoy the indwelling of it, and union with it; but that Unbelievers have it so far, at least as to reprove them, and call them to repentance, is clear from many Scriptures, especially *John* 16. 8. *Prov.* 1. 23, 24.

In Answer to one Argument of mine, he saith, *A Believer needs not any immediate Dictate, to assure him that he is a Child of God, seeing by the assistance of the Spirit effectively, he may draw a conclusion from Scripture Premisses, in applying the Scripture marks.* But to this I Answer, that the Scripture only telleth him one of the Premisses, of that they call the practical Syllogism; but no Scripture in all the Bible telleth *J. A.* or me, that he, or I have these marks; and seeing a true Believer

may

may attain to a Faith of assurance, as *J. A.* doth not deny; and Faith must have the Word of God for its object, seeing there is not a word in all the Scripture that saith, he or I have those marks, we must seek that word somewhere else then in the Scripture; and where shall we seek it else but in our Hearts, where the Spirit himself witnesseth with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God, (if so be, that we have that witness) even as it did witness in *Paul.* And if the illumination of the Spirit discover the Graces of God in our Souls, certainly that is an Immediate Revelation; for Scripture doth not discover in us those Graces, but the Spirit; and he that discovers the Graces, discovereth also himself to be the true Spirit of God, and doth not hide himself from us; or else we might doubt whether the discovery were true or not, not knowing infallibly the Author thereof.

Lastly, That he saith, *I spurn at the distinction of objective and subjective Illumination, as Anti-christian and deceitful.* I Answer, I do not blame the distinction simply as in it self, but as it is illused and applyed: Whereas they say, *The influence and illumination of the Spirit in Believers, is meerly effective or subjective, and not at all objective*: But I say it is both effective and objective; effective to help us to See or Hear; and objective, or by way of ob-

ject,

ject, for the Sight and Hearing, or any other perception of our Souls to ſtay and reſt upon; but this object, can no more be the Letter of Scripture alone, than a report of Meat and Drink, can be the object to ſatisfie a mans Taſte, or Appetite, when he is Hungry or Thirſty: And thus I do not confound the diſtinct conſiderations of objective and effective; only I affirm, that the ſame thing may be both, and ſo indeed is; as when the *Sun* enlightens us, its Ray or Beam helps us to ſee, and alſo it is the object of our ſight: And the Heat of the Fire is both the object of our Feeling, and alſo when it is moderate helpeth us to feel, and effectively doth ſtrengthen our Feeling: But when the Fire heateth a ſtone, it worketh in it only effectively, and not objectively, or as an object; but Believers receive not the Heavenly Light and warmth of the Spirit as dead and inſenſible ſtones, but as living Souls that have a real ſenſe and perception of that which doth influence them; and therefore that influence is the proper immediate object of their perception. And if there be no inward Spiritual object, that the Spirit preſents to Gods Children, then there is no inward Spiritual Eye nor Ear, nor inward Spiritual Taſte or Savour, nor inward Spiritual Feeling, all which is moſt contrary, both to Scripture, (which men-

mentions all theſe Spiritual Senſes, as I have proved at large in my Book of *Immediate Revelation*) and alſo to the Saints experiences. And doth not God promiſe, that his Children ſhall ſee him under the New Covenant; and certainly all ſight that is proper is immediate. And to ſay, that the Saints only ſee God by the Scriptures, is but as much as to ſay, that we only ſee our Father, by a report of him, or that we only ſee the outward *Sun* by ones telling us that it ſhines, who hath indeed ſeen it; or that we only ſee our Native Country in which we live and dwell, by looking at the Map of it: But certainly ſuch a remote and improper ſeeing does no wiſe anſwer to the Glory of the New Covenant, but rather falleth ſhort of the Old: And if that be all to ſee God in the Scriptures, then all thoſe that lived under the Old Covenant ſaw God, as clearly as Believers under the New Covenant, ſeeing they had the Scriptures in great part. But I remember a good ſaying of *S. R.* in one of his Epiſtles, that I hope may have ſome weight with *J. A. That is little* (ſaith he) *to ſee Chriſt in a Book*, (which yet the Scripture is) and certainly if *J. A.* has ſeen no more of God, or Chriſt, but what he has had a report of, from the Letter of the Scripture; I muſt needs ſay, he is a great ſtranger to the New Covenant Diſpenſation, and is ſtill like

ſo

ſo to remain, while he diſputes in unbelief againſt ſo great a Bleſſing, that if he did believe, he might attain unto: But I wiſh the Lord may open his Eyes, and then he will no more contend againſt ſuch a thing.

J. A. proceedeth further to diſpute againſt the Dictate, or Witneſs of the Spirit within, although he ſaith, *He hath ſufficiently affronted it, yet becauſe it is worthy of a thouſand deaths, for its proud uſurpation*, as he ſaith, *he will reach it ſome few blowes more.* To this I Anſwer, that theſe exceeding bold and daring words, againſt the Bleſſed Dictates or Words of Gods Holy Spirit in the Hearts of his people, hath not a little moved me with Commiſeration and pity, praying heartily that the Lord may forgive him.

But now let us ſee further, what he ſaith againſt the inward Dictate. *Firſt*, he ſaith, *It is not eſſentially right and infallible, becauſe all men have not the Spirit:* But to this is Anſwered already. And whether all men have the Spirit in ſome ſenſe, Yea or Nay; it is agreed upon by all ſober Writers, that there is an infallible and incorruptible Law planted by God in all men, even thoſe who have not the Scriptures, which the Lawyers call *Syndereſis*, that is, the foundation of all juſt and good Laws; and if that were deſtroyed or corrupted, all Juſtice ſhould utterly periſh among

mong that part of mankind, in whom it ſhould be deſtroyed or corrupted. But this *J. A.* like a blind man he ſtriketh ſo raſhly with his ſuppoſed Blowes, that he not only fighteth againſt our Religion, and Principle, but even againſt all the Lawyers and Juſticiaries, and all other ſober Writers, on theſe matters, who do all unanimouſly plead, that there is ſuch an incorruptible Law implanted or imprinted by the Creator in all men: And certainly if that Law could be corrupted and changed from its eſſential rectitude and purity, to tranſgreſs it, were no ſin; for a corrupt and impure Law, can be no Law of God. And doth not *Paul* ſpeak of the Law that was in the Hearts of the *Gentiles*, which he did not ſay, they did or could corrupt, *But that they held the Truth in unrighteouſneſs*, Rom. 2. 15 compared 1. 18. Again he argueth, *That as for Believers, they need no Inward Dictate or Teaching of the Spirit, ſeeing the whole Doctrine of Salvation is abundantly made known in the Scriptures.* But I Anſwer, That the whole Doctrine of Salvation is abundantly made known in the Scriptures, that the Inward Teaching and Revelation of God by his Spirit is needleſs, is a thing he barely doth alledge, without proof, as his ordinary cuſtom is: And indeed his manner of Argument is, as if one ſhould ſay, the Card or Map of

the

the Earth, doth abundantly make the Earth known unto us, with the things therein; and therefore we need no other knowledge of the Earth, nor of any thing in it; we need not ſee the Earth it ſelf, nor Taſte any of the Fruits of it; and when we Hunger or Thirſt, we need neither Bread nor Drink, the report of theſe things can ſatisfie our Appetite well enough: Or if one ſhould ſay to a Woman that intirely loves her Husband, thou haſt many of thy Husbands Letters, and Books; alſo thou haſt his Picture very perfectly drawn, to look upon, and it cannot be better drawn than it is done already, and therefore what needs thou to hear or ſee thy Husband himſelf. The application is eaſie, for certainly as the report of Meat and Drink, cannot ſatisfie one that is Hungry and Thirſty, though it be never ſo full, and as to hear or read of our moſt dear and beloved Friends, is not enough to ſatisfie our deſire after them; but over and above all that others can tell us of them, we deſire to hear and ſee them, and converſe with them immediately; ſo a report of God and Chriſt, cannot ſatisfie the Souls of Gods people, but they deſire a nearer knowledge of him, whom their Souls love, and which he doth alſo give unto them, according to his promiſe, *Joh.* 14. 21. *He that loveth me,* (ſaid Chriſt) *ſhall be loved of my Father*

ther, *and I will manifest my self unto him.* And why did Christ promise, that he would send his Spirit to Teach them all things, if the Teaching of his Spirit was a needless thing? Might they not have answered according to *J. A.* thou needest not send thy Spirit to Teach us, we have the Scriptures that abundantly Teach us all things needful to be known; and what is not expresly contained in the Scriptures, we can gather it by consequence from the Scripture, and therefore there is no need of sending the Spirit to Teach us, it is but a superfluous labour. But however this Language favours to such whole persons as *J. A.* that need not the Physician; yet those that are truly Sick, Poor and Indigent, do need the Lord and his Spirit to Teach them, and also to speak unto them; without which they cannot be healed, refreshed and comforted, by all that they can read or hear from the Letter of the Scriptures, or what man can Preach unto them, until the Lord by his Spirit speak unto them himself.

And in the close of his Argument against the necessity of the Inward Teaching, or Dictate of the Spirit of God, he pleadeth, *That it is inconsistent, to hold an infallible Dictate of the Spirit to be in any man, and yet that man in any respect, to Think, Speak, Write, or act fallibly: And this when Peter de-*

nyed

lyed Christ, as also when Christ reproved him, for saying, be it far from thee Master: Peter according to *J. A.* had no infallible Dictate in him: And seeing *J. A.* doth plead that the Apostles did sin in Thought, Word and Deed, so long as they lived upon Earth, and to sin is to act fallibly, it must needs follow by his doctrine, that none of the Apostles had any infallible Dictate. But why may they not err who have an infallible Dictate within, as they may err who have the Scripture without, that is infallible? May not a man have an infallible guide and way before him, and yet through unwatchfulness, not follow that infallible guide and way. Again, whereas he pleads, *That there is no middle betwixt fallible and infallible.* I Answer, to be universally fallible, and partly infallible, I grant is a contradiction, and admitteth no midst, but yet to be partly infallible, *viz.* so far as a man doth follow the infallible Teaching and leading of Gods Spirit; and partly fallible, *viz.* so far as at another instant or moment, or hour, and in another thing he waiteth not for his guide, but runneth before, or turneth aside from him: I say, these two are no contradiction. And I ask *J. A.* hath he no infallibility nor infallible knowledge in any thing? Doth he not believe and know infallibly that there is a God, and divers

other

other weighty Truths. This I judge he will not deny; well then. According to his *Logick*, if he be infallible, when he Thinks, Says, or Writs that there is a God, he must be infallible in all other things that he either Thinks, Writes, or speaks, because according to his Doctrine, there is no midle betwixt fallible and infallible. *J. A.* should have better remembred his *School-Logick*, which Teacheth, that contradictory propositions are not betwixt two universals, nor two particulars; but the one universal, and the other particular.

His 3d Argument against the Dictate of the Spirit of God within, is the same with his 4th Argument that is formerly Answered above, concerning the Scripture. And surely this repeating of Arguments, as if they were new ones, when they are nothing but old ones formerly used, argueth great barrenness of matter in *J. A.* else he would not run into such needless and idle Tautologies. But he thinks I have yeilded the cause to him, because I grant, all Doctrines, that agree not with the Scriptures, are to be rejected; therefore the Scripture is a superior rule to all such false Doctrines I grant. Therefore the Scripture is Superior to the Spirit of God and his Dictate in our Hearts, I deny it. And though we are to examine the inward Dictates of Gods Spi-

rit by the Scriptures, yet that proves not that the Scriptures are ſuperior; no more, than that it proves that the words of the Prophets were ſuperior to the words of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, becauſe the people examined the latter by the former.

His fourth Argument is built upon a Suppoſition, that the Scriptures are the principal rule, and conſequently not the Spirit inwardly Dictating in our hearts. But he hath not proved that the Scripture is a more principal rule, then the Spirit. Although in reſpect of all outward rules that can be named, or conceived, the Scripture is the moſt principal rule. Nor is it any repugnancy to ſay, the Scripture is the principal external rule, by which all Doctrines and Principles of Religion are to be examined, and what is contrary to Scripture is to be rejected; and yet to ſay alſo that the Spirit himſelf, perſwading or aſſuring us, of the Truth of the Scripture, is the principal inward rule, ſeeing theſe two principles are in differing kinds, the one external, or without us, the other internal, and within us, which are very well conſiſtent, and mutually bear witneſs one of another, even as *John* bare witneſs to Chriſt, and Chriſt bare witneſs to *John*: Although Chriſt needed not the Teſtimony of *John*, as for himſelf.

His

His fourth Argument concludeth only againſt a thing, which we do no wiſe deny, *viz. That every Dictate within is not the Rule*: And *J. A.* might have ſpared his pains to diſpute againſt that, which no man holdeth. For who is ſo abſurd to think that every Dictate, ſuppoſe it be of a mans own vain and fooliſh mind, or of the Devil, is to be received as his rule. The Queſtion is not concerning every Dictate, nor indeed concerning any other, then that alone Dictate of the Spirit of God and of Chriſt in men, which hath a ſelf evidence unto him, who hath it, as *J. A.* muſt needs acknowledge it had to the Prophets and Apoſtles. But he objects, *That the Devil may preſent an Impoſture unto a man, with ſo much ſeeming evidence, as with the concurrence of a deceitful heart, will make it be received for a Divine Truth, eſpecially by that man that for the preſent time has no Divine Dictate.* To this I Anſwer, That the perſon ſuppoſed by *J. A.* is either one that the Lord hath in his juſt judgment for ſome great unfaithfulneſs, and abuſe of Light formerly given, delivered up to *Satan*'s deluſions, ſuch as theſe mentioned 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 11. And as for him, and the like ſort, the Scripture cannot help him: For certainly he that is given up by the Lord, to the deluſion of Satan, as a puniſhment of his ſinning againſt the Light he once

had, will misunderstand the Scripture, and cannot otherwise do, even as the *Jews* and *Sadducees* did of old. But as for others that are not so given up by the Lord, it ought not to be supposed, that they can altogether want some Divine Dictate, or witness of Gods Spirit, to testifie against the strongest delusion of Satan. And therefore he to whom Satan presents such a delusion, if he hath a sincere love to the Truth, by comparing the delusion with the true Dictate or Light of Christ that witnesseth against it, may readily discover it, to be a delusion; and if the said delusion be contrary to any Doctrine expresly declared in the Scripture, the Scripture will also be a secondary confirmation to him, that what is so presented to him, is but a delusion. But many times Satan presents delusions to men to do, or act things, that are not simply in themselves unlawful, or contrary to Scripture. And then I Query by what rule, shall these delusions be discovered? But I confess *J. A.* hath a very short way, but yet very false and unsound to resolve this question, *viz. Positively to conclude, that all inward Dictates and suggestions whatsoever that any man finds in himself, are utterly to be rejected, as being any Command of God, or any Divine Testimony, seeing there are none such in the hearts of men.* They are all according to him, either a mans

own

own thoughts or ſuggeſtions of Satan: And therefore nothing that a man hath in him is to be relyed upon. But it is ſtrange Doctrine, that Satan ſhall be ſo near always to Dictate evil, even unto the Children of God, immediately; but God and Chriſt ſhall be at ſuch a diſtance, as not once in a mans whole life time, to Dictate in him immediately that which is good. The which Doctrine of *J. A.* is ſo favourable to the Devil, and ſo advantagious to advance and uphold his Kingdom among men, that this one conſideration is enough to render it ſuſpected that it is not of God, but of the adverſary.

CHAP

CHAP. VII.

IN the Third Section of his *Survey* upon the Fourth Query, *J. A.* pretends to Answer our Objections or Reasons, *That there is a Word or Dictate of God in our Hearts, or Christ himself that doth Dictate or Teach in us; and who is the principal Rule of Faith and Life.* All which Objections he brings them not, either in matter or form as used by us, but miserably perverts the most of them to a contrary sense and intent, as if we did use those Reasons to oppose an outward Ministry, or the use of outward Preaching, Hearing, Reading, Praying; none of which we oppose; but on the contrary, we own all these things, as both needful to be done, seeing they are commanded of God, and as profitable to men; yea, to the most advanced and experienced Saints, when duly practised. And it is an exceeding great mistake in our Adversaries generally to suppose, That our Principle of Immediate Revelation, or the Immediate Teachings of the Spirit doth destroy, or make null and void the use of the Scriptures, or any other means: For by Immediate, we mean

not

not Immediate in oppoſition to thoſe things, that are means truly appointed of God, as Reading the Scriptures, Preaching, Praying, Meditating, Singing, Waiting. But on the contrary we ſay, It is only by the help of the Spirits immediate Teachings and Leadings, that thoſe and the like means are made effectual, and profitable to the People of God. For if the Prophets and Apoſtles their having Immediate Revelation, did not make void the uſe of the Scriptures unto them, nor the uſe of Preaching, Praying, Reading, Meditating, Waiting and Watching, no more doth our having it. Again, our Adverſaries grant, that God doth operate or work immediately, by an immediate effective illumination of his Spirit, in the hearts of all his People, and that this immediateneſs doth not hinder, or make void the uſe of means, but make them the more profitable and uſeful; even ſo nor the immediate objective illumination, doth in the leaſt made void the means, as is already ſaid in the caſe of the Prophets and Apoſtles; and *Paul* ſaid, the Scriptures were writ for his and his Brethrens Learning, even his fellow Apoſtles, as well as other Chriſtians. And to ſay or think the contrary, is as abſurd and unreaſonable, as who would ſay, a Scholar that is taught of his Maſter immediately is not to read upon any Book, nor to hearken

to any of his fellow Scholars, that may be as well or better learned than himself; and on the other hand, to set up the means in opposition to the Lords immediate Teachings, is equally unreasonable as to conclude, such a man has Books whereon to learn, and therefore it can profit him nothing to be taught immediately, or *viva voce*, and by word of mouth by a Living Teacher. Now both these extreams, our Principle, and the Scripture, and also our good experience have taught us to shun. And the immediateness of the Spirits illuminations, both effectively and objectively to work and operate in us, in the use of all the means appointed of God, (sometimes in the use of one means, and sometimes in the use of another; as now in Reading, then in Hearing; now in Preaching, then in Praying; now in Meditating, then in Singing or Praising God; now in giving Alms, then in visiting the Sick, or those that are in Prison; and sometimes, as the mind is retired in pure silence to wait upon the Lord, which may be as well and as truly called a mean, as any of the former. I say the immediateness of the Spirits Communications and Illuminations, in the use of those and the like means aforesaid) do as well consist with the means, and the means with them, as the immediate Sun-shine and influence of the heat, and comfortable

forrable warmth of the Sun, which worketh both effectively and objectively upon us, consist with the means; when we walk or travel on the Road at noon day, or labour in the Field, Plough, Digg, Sow, Reap, and use any other manual operation, the which means are so far from hindring, or making void the necessity of the Suns immediate influence and concurrence, that none of these things can be well or comfortably performed without it. And in this large and general sense of the word means, which also is true, it may be warrantably enough said, without any prejudice to our principle of Immediate Revelation, that we have no ground to expect any Immediate Manifestation or Revelation of God, but in the use of some one means or another, that God requireth us to be found in. For there is not one hour, or moment of our Life, but there is something of Duty or Obedience that we ought to be found in, either inwardly or outwardly (if we have the use of our understandings as men) and every act of Obedience may and ought truly to be called a means of our receiving somewhat immediately of God, to wit, our Faith, our Love, our Hope, our Holy Fear, our Care, our Watchfulness, our Praying, Meditating, and silent Waiting; and in one word, our whole Obedience, all these are as truly and

pro-

properly means, as Preaching, or reading in the Scriptures. And thus every one that is most diligently exercised in the true means, has greatest access unto God, and doth most abundantly partake of the immediate Revelations and Communications of God's Holy Spirit, Light, Life, Love, Vertue, Power, and Wisdom. And if it be said, Why are they called then *Immediate*; I Answer, Because we feel or perceive them most near unto us even as near, or rather more near unto us, as the things or actions wherein we are exercised, giving Spiritual Vigour, Life, and lustre unto them, without which they are but as dead or lifeless. And thus even as when the soul liveth in the Body, it is said to be immediately united with it, and act immediately therein or therewith, although it useth the Body as its Instrument: Even so the Spirit of God and of Christ, livingly indwelling in the Saints, and united with them, and they with him, is said to act immediately in them, and with them, although the Lord useth them as means or instruments to work with him. And as for the word *Immediate Revelation*, seeing it is not any express Scripture phrase, no not in the case of the Prophets and Apostles, so far as I can remember, if the thing it self were granted, to wit, *That God doth inwardly reveal and speak his mind, or shew his Glory, and glorious Power*

Power and Presence in his Children, as he did in and to his Saints of Old; so that the Saints do Hear, See and perceive, also Taste and Savour, and feel after God Himself, as he reveals himself in his Son, by the Holy Spirit, the Controversy about the Name or Phrase should soon be at an end; for it did satisfie the Prophets and Apostles, who had it in great measure to call it simply *Revelation*, and *Vision*, or the like, without adding the word *Immediate*: for in those daies, it seemeth that deceitful distinction of *Mediate* and *Immediate Revelation* was not found out in the World; I call it deceitful and false, because, to speak properly, all *Revelation* is *Immediate*, even as all *Vision* is *Immediate*; and so is all Hearing, for I can neither see nor hear a man, unless I see and hear him immediately. And as for the Scripture, when it is called a *Revelation*, it should be figuratively understood, as when it is called a *Vision*; for none will say that *Isaiah* his Book is really the *Vision* it self which he saw, but only a declaration of it. And as he could not write the intellectual Vision that he saw, to speak properly, so nor could he write the intellectual Voice, Word or Words, that he did only intellectually hear, but only a Report or Declaration of them, the which doth far come short of what he saw, or heard; and in this respect, *Paul* saith, that he heard *verba ineffabilia*,

fabilia, unſpeakable words, that could not be uttered or expreſſed, and ſo did all the Prophets and Apoſtles; for indeed the words of the mouth, as they can be ſpoken and writ, fall ſhort many times to expreſs the depth of what we inwardly think or receive in natural things, and how much more to expreſs what God doth inwardly ſpeak or reveal, which yet is no derogation from the words of Scripture, for it is acknowledged by us to be a bleſſed inſtrument, in the hand of the Spirit for our Inſtruction. And though we cannot be ſo bold as to ſay, That the true God is not Worſhipped, nor known ſavingly, where the Scripture is wanting, as *J. A.* doth alledge more daringly, I ſuppoſe, than many of his Brethren that that are more ſober will allow, yet we do believe and freely acknowledge that the Scriptures are ordinary means, (but yet not without the inward Direction, Revelation and Teaching of God's own Spirit) of Peoples Inſtruction, in all Nations, according to *Rom.* 16.26. and thoſe Nations that want the Scriptures, are, no doubt, for moſt part, in great darkneſs; But why ſome Nations want the bleſſing of the Scriptures belongeth to the ſecret Judgments of God; and as for us, who have them, let us be thankful to God, and earneſtly ſeek the holy Spirit that gave them forth, without which they will be a Sealed

Book

Book unto us, whether learned or unlearned, as it is at this day unto the unbelieving Jews, and also unto many thousands of unfaithful Professors of Christ, who in works deny him. And thus, by what is said, how and in what manner we own the Word of God in our Hearts, immediately Speaking and Teaching, as our principal Rule, *J. A.* his Cavils, and false Charges are sufficiently Answered, which may serve to all his Third Section. Yet to Answer to some things more particularly, whereas *J. A.* alledgeth, *That the Word mentioned*, Deut. 30. 14. *is not Christ, but the Books or Writings of* Moses. To this I Answer, But whether shall we rather believe *J. A.* or the Apostle *Paul*, who, *Rom.* 10. doth plainly expound it of Christ; see Verse 4. compared with Verse 5, 6, 7, 8. when he distinguisheth betwixt the Law and Christ, as preferring Christ to the Law; and he saith, *Christ is the end of the Law*, which he proveth out of *Moses*'s words, *Deut.* 30. 14. and therefore these words of *Moses* are to be understood of Christ, and so did *Clements Alexandrinus*, and others of the Fathers understand them. But saith *J. A.* Moses *tyes them strictly to the external written Word of the Scriptures*. But what then, doth he so tye them, as that they were not to regard God, or Christ, or the Holy Spirit in their Hearts? How wild and unreasonable

sonable is this consequence? Could the people understand the true Spiritual intent and signification of the Law, without Christ and his Spirit, and inward Teaching? Was it not the fault of the people, that they stuck so close to the bare outward performances of the Law, and neglected Christ and his Spirit, which could alone give the understanding of it: And therefore when he came in the flesh, they rejected him.

Secondly, as to *Jeremiah* 31. *v.* 31, 32. we do not bring this place to overthrow the external Rule of the Scripture, or true outward Teaching, as *J. A.* falsly doth alleadge, but only to prove, that God himself doth Teach his people under the New Covenant; so that they hear God himself, and learn of him; which yet doth not hinder, yet they both also may and ought to hear all those, whom God sendeth. And certainly that Scripture expression to be Taught of God; is more, or a further thing then to be Taught by the Letter of the Scripture, or by *Moses* and the Prophets Writings; otherwise it might be said, that the people simply by the Old Covenant, was as much Taught of God, as under the New.

Thirdly, Nor do we bring *Luke* 17. 20, 21. where Christ saith, *The Kingdom of God is within you*, to exclude all External helps and means,

means, as *J. A.* doth again no leſs falſely alleadge. But only to prove that there is an inward Principle of Chriſts Light, Life and Grace in men, whereby he ruleth in thoſe that are obedient unto the ſame; and even in them, who are diſobedient, it hath its Rule and Kingdom ſo far as to judge and condemn them; which yet it could not do, without ſome inward Dictate or witneſs.

Fourthly, As to *John* 16. 13. where Chriſt *Promiſes to ſend his Spirit to guide us into all Truth*: Nor do we bring this to oppoſe all outward Teaching, Reading, Learning, &c. But ſtill we ſay, ſeeing it was a promiſe made to the Apoſtles, as well as unto us, it implyeth a real inward Teaching of God, and the Spirit; that is ſomewhat further, then the outward Teaching whatſomever, which if it may and ought to be called immediate in the Apoſtles, may and ought alſo to be called immediate in Gods people now, and always to the end of the World, ſeeing the promiſe is the ſame to both; and therefore hath the ſame performance at leaſt in kind, if not in degree.

Fifthly, The ſame falſe and abſurd charge he is guilty of, as to 1 *John* 2. 20, 27. which mentioneth, *The Anointing which taught them all things, ſo that they needed not any man to Teach them*. For we bring not this place to

oppoſe

oppose all outward Preaching or Teaching of men, of God truly sent and called by him; But only the bare dead and dry Teaching of men, who run, and God hath not sent them. And also the words may be understood in respect of an absolute necessity; so as they who are come to that inward Anointing, and that it abide in them, they have not an absolute necessity of outward true Teachers, so as they must need perish, for want of them, if so be at any time, they could not be had, as doth at times come to pass. And thus also that of *Jeremiah* 31. 31, 32, 33, 34. is to be understood, importing likewise that all True Believers, should have that experimental knowledge of God and acquaintance with him, by the inward Teachings of his Spirit, so as none should be wholly ignorant of God, but all should know him in measure; and therefore it should not be needful to say unto any of them, know the Lord; as if they were utterly ignorant of him, in respect of Spiritual and experimental knowledge, as indeed many or most of the people under the Law were: Which yet hinders not, but that still there will be both need and great use of True Teachers in the Church to the Worlds end, though not to say, know the Lord, (as if they did not in any measure know him) yet to promote and advance them who know

him

him already, in more knowledge of him, and of the great and deep Myſteries of his Kingdom.

Sixthly, He ſaith, *That engrafted word mentioned* Jam. 1. 21. which we are bid receive, *is the Scripture, and not Chriſt, or his Light.* For he ſaith, *We cannot in proper Speech be ſaid to receive or hear a Dictate within, which we have already, and is not audible properly.* But how weak is this Argument? Could not the Prophets and Apoſtles both hear and receive Chriſt, whom they had already? were they not ſtill more and more to receive him. And have we not the Scripture already, and conſequently according to *J. A.* we cannot receive it. And that he ſaith, *A Dictate within is not audible properly.* But why not as properly, as a Dictate without? Seeing the Spiritual Hearing and Seeing are as proper in their kind, as the Natural are in their kind. And according to this reaſoning of *J. A.* none of the Prophets nor Apoſtles were to hear God, or the Spirit in them, ſeeing nothing within, is audible properly. And as for the word ἔμφυτον that is *Engliſhed, Engrafted*, it doth moſt properly ſignifie innate, and is commonly underſtood of that which originally is Grafted or Implanted in us; and in this ſenſe is uſed generally both by Chriſtian and Heathen Writers, as it is contra-

distinguished from that which is outwardly received. Hence the natural love or affection that is in mankind, is said to be ἄγραφος the which is not a thing outwardly received, and consequently the λογος ἄγραφος, cannot be the Letter of the Scripture, but a Divine principle immediately grafted into our Souls, when God Created them? and in respect of which, men are said to be made in the Image of God.

Seventhly, He alledgeth, that we bring *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. *To oppose and reject all External Ordinances out of the Church citing Principles of Truth*, pag. 63, 68, 77, 80. And here he insulteth not a little, as if by the same Argument, *The* Quakers *were obliged to reject the very Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, and the foundation of Repentance and Faith, as well as Water-Baptism.* But to this I Answer, having examined these pages cited by him, I do not find, that they mention or intend any thing of rejecting the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, or External Ordinances. And let but the Reader examine the words, and he shall find, that nothing further is intended, than this, that people should not sit down, or build their Faith upon a form of words, though never so sound, but should come further than all words; so that leaving them behind, as in respect of a foundation, they

were

were to come unto Christ the true foundation, and grow up in him unto perfection. And as for Water-baptism, that place of the *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. doth not mention it, among the principles of the Doctrine of Christ, but only the Doctrine of Baptisms, which is another thing than Water-Baptism. For although we have not Water-Baptism among us, yet we have the Doctrine of Baptisms, that is set down, with other principles of our Faith, as in divers other of our Book, so in that mentioned by him, called, *The Principles of Truth.* Now to leave a form of Words, or Articles and Propositions concerning Faith, which commonly are called Principles, so as not to set them up for the principal and only foundation of our Faith, which people are but too ready to do. This is not to reject them, no more than when a man leaves his Affairs he hath been conversant in, and goeth to his Bed to rest him with moderate sleep, is to reject his Affairs, for he returneth unto them again.

Eighthly, He saith, *We object that* Enoch, Noah, Abraham, *&c. Had not the Scripture to be their Rule, and therefore nor are we to have it to be our Rule*: And this he makes as ridiculous a consequence, as to say, the Scriptures were not written in the primitive World, therefore neither afterwards. But I

Answer, that to argue from thence, that the Scripture is not to be our only and principal Rule, is both safe and pertinent. For if *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham* had the Spirit to be a Rule unto them, it is no less a rule unto all now, who have the same Faith which they had; seeing the same Spirit is given to Believers now, which they had, which Spirit is one, as *Paul* hath declared; and it is most Rational, that as the Faith is one, in all Ages of the World, and the Spirit one, so the Principal rule of Faith should be one also.

Ninthly, He saith, *I object*, (*Quakerism no Popery*, pag. 9. 13.) *That the Testimony of the Spirit within, is greater than the External Testimony of the Scripture; and therefore the said Testimony of the Spirit is the Principal Rule.* To which he roundly Answereth, by denying that there is any such Testimony of the Spirit within Believers; and because I say there is, he alledgeth I drive the Plough before the Oxen. But I Answer, that I have proved it sufficiently already; and now also I have Answered I hope sufficiently, all his objections against it. And here I desire the Reader to take notice, how that notwithstanding *J. A.* saith elsewhere, as Pag. 44. *That he and his Brethren never denyed the Spirits Teaching*, Yet how inconsistent that is, with denying any Testimony of the Spirit, or

Dictate

Dictate thereof, in mens hearts. Is the Teaching of the Spirit, only an outward thing? Is it nothing else, but to Hear or Read the Letter of the Scripture? And are they all Taught of the Spirit, who are but only and meerly Taught by the Letter? But if it be granted, that there is an inward Teaching of the Spirit, distinct from the outward Teaching of the Scripture, although not separated therefrom, or without the outward, as I know some of the more sober doth acknowledge; then I say, is not that inward Teaching a Testimony of the Spirit? For to affirm it to be a Teaching, and no Testimony, seemeth to me to be a great contradiction. And as for us, although we cannot say that the inward Teaching or Testimony of the Spirit is never in any case, without the outward; yet we grant it is oft accompanied with the outward, and in that case, it is no less truly immediate, than if it were without it, as I have already shewed. And supposing, but not at all granting, that the inward Teaching of the Spirit were never without the outward of the Letter; yet seeing the outward Teaching of the Letter, is oft without the inward, (for many are Taught by the Letter, who are not Spiritually Taught, all that the Letter hath outwardly Taught them) it followeth evidently that the inward Teaching of the

Spirit, and outward Teaching of the Letter are distinct things, as is manifest from that sure maxime, that when two things can be seperate, so as the one to be without the other, they are really distinct. This Argument I used in my Book called *Quakerism no Popery*; but *J. A.* hath made no reply to it. And still I say, if the inward Teaching of the Spirit be denyed, it doth follow, that in respect of any inward Speaking, or Teaching, God doth no more intelligibly or perceptibly speak to the Saints, than he speaketh to the Earth to bring forth Grass; the which consequence *J. A.* seemeth to allow, but how absurdly, I leave to sober men to judge.

And whereas *J. A.* saith, *That God doth not always make use of the greater Witnesses for testifying his will to us.* I Answer, In respect of men and Angels, it is true: But notwithstanding God hath given himself, and his own Holy Spirit, which is one with him, to be unto us a witness of his will; and this is the greatest witness that can be given: See *Rom.* 8. 16. 1 *Joh.* 5. 8, 9.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

IN his pretended Survey of the Fifth Query, he begins with two false Charges against us, the First, *That we deny all Scripture Interpretation*; the Second, *That we deny all Scripture Consequences*; And to refute these idle Suppositions, which are none of our Assertions, he spendeth many Pages of his Book to no purpose, and wherein we are nothing concerned to Answer: For we own both Scripture interpretation, and just and necessary consequences of Scripture; but then we say, that these interpretations and consequences ought to be by the help and direction of the same Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures, immediately teaching them to interpret, and to draw such consequences therefrom; to which *J. A.* doth not pretend, nor any of his Brethren. For all the Interpretations and consequences which Christ or the Apostles used, were by the same Spirit that was in the Prophets; and *Peter* saith expressly that no Prophecy of Scripture is of private Interpretation; and it is said of Christ, that he opened the understandings of the Disciples that they might

understand the Scriptures, which opening was by his Spirit that he gave unto them, and seeing the Scripture cannot be understood without the opening of the Spirit that gave it forth, it cannot be interpreted without the same; nor can consequences be lawfully deduced from Scriptures without it; for how can a man interpret what he doth not understand? or how can he deduce a consequence from that whereof he is ignorant?

And there is yet another fault that we find in *J. A.* and his Brethrens interpretations of Scripture and consequences therefrom, that they keep not closely to Scripture it self, when they interpret, or draw consequences, but for most part, mingle with the Scripture words many of their false principles and Axioms of that they call their Philosophy. For as I have already said, the most part of that they call their Philosophy, is utterly false or uncertain; nor are the Teachers of it agreed among themselves, in their Principles and Axioms. And yet their Consequences are commonly from one or other of these false or uncertain Maxims or Principles which they joyn with the Scripture, in which case the consequences are not purely Scriptural. For seeing in Argumentation, the Conclusion or Consequence is drawn from two Propositions or Premisses, one of which may be true, the other false. Again, the one may

be

be true and certain, the other although true, yet may be to us uncertain and doubtful; in which cases, the consequence or conclusion is always of the nature of the weaker premise, hence if but one of the premisses be false, the conclusion is false, although the other Premise be true: And if one of the Premisses be unclear or uncertain, the conclusion is also uncertain. And again, if one of the Premisses be Scripture, and the other be but some principle or maxime of Natural Philosophy so called, the conclusion in that case is not Scriptural, but Natural: And thus much is generally acknowledged by all the Schoolmen so called. And hence it is that the School-Divinity, as it is so termed is rejected by many, as a dubious and uncertain thing, because the conclusions thereof, for most part, depend not on Scripture Propositions, but uncertain and doubtful principles and maxims of that called Natural Philosophy. But again, suppose one should draw a consequence from Premisses that are both Scriptural; yet seeing the terms in those Premisses may have different significations, as the words, Flesh, Spirit, Life, Light, Man, and many others, that have one signification in one place of Scripture, and quite another in another part of Scripture; the conclusion in that case doth not follow, for not only the Art of

Lo-

Logick, but Common Reason it self Teacheth us, that in all Arguments, the word or term that is used in both Premisses, must have the same sense and signification in both. Now he who has not the direction of the same Spirit that did Dictate the Scripture, hath not this discerning so as to know the true sense or signification of Scripture words, as they signify Spiritual Misteries and things; *For the Natural man understands not the Things of God*, as saith the Scripture, and therefore he is utterly unfit to reason about them. By which natural man I understand, any man considered as never so well furnished with all Natural helps of his Parts and Arts, but wanting the Spirit of God, or at least not making use of the help of it, but puting another thing in its room. And thus much shall suffice at present to the Intelligent Reader, how and after what manner we own both Scripture Interpretations and Consequences; and yet may very well deny *J. A.* his Interpretations and Consequences, and all such as he is, who declare themselves Enemies to that Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures, as necessary to help them in interpreting and drawing Consequences from Scripture. And albeit *J. A.* use many Arguments to prove, that Interpretations of Scripture are lawful, and Consequences therefrom; as that Christ and the Apostles

Apoſtles did interpret the Scriptures, and draw Conſequences therefrom; yet all this proves not, that *J. A.* his Interpretations and Conſequences, without the ſame Spirit, which they had, are as good, which is all one as to ſay, Chriſt and the Apoſtles did Interpret the Scriptures, and argue from them by the Spirit: And therefore *J. A.* and his Brethren may as well do it, without the Spirit; but who having common Senſe, doth not ſee the unreaſonableneſs of this Conſequence. Again, as for the *Levites* their Expounding the Scripture, which is another Argument of *J. A.* it remaineth for him to prove, that theſe *Levites* who did rightly Interpret the Scripture, did it without the Spirit of God, and meerly by their own Natural Underſtanding. And what if theſe *Levites* were not in all reſpects Infallible? it doth not therefore follow, that they had no Infallible direction of Gods Spirit, when they did rightly Interpret the Scripture. And indeed this is a third falſe Charge of *J. A.* againſt us, as if we did hold, that none is to Intepret the Scripture, but he who is ſimply and abſolutely, or in all reſpects Infallible, which we affirm not. Not is that the true ſtate of the Queſtion, but this, *Whether any ſhould give an Interpretation of Scripture, without he be Infallibly perſwaded by the Spirit of God, that he hath received it from the Lord.*

Lord. We ſay, Nay, otherwiſe he Preacheth not the Word of God to the people, but his own Fallible conjecture. Now it is one thing to be ſimply or univerſally Infallible, and another thing to be Infallibly directed in ſome particular caſes of Interpreting ſome particular places of Scripture, as God giveth to a man the help of his Spirit ſo to do. And thus *J. A.* his two firſt Sections, wherein he ſpendeth 18 Pages are ſufficiently Anſwered. In the beginning of his third Section, concerning Baptiſm with Water, he alledgeth falſly upon us, *That wherever Baptiſm is mentioned in the New Teſtament, and the word Water is not expreſly added; that we always deny Baptiſm with Water, there to be meant.* This is falſe, for we grant, that though Water be not expreſſed, yet in ſome places, Baptiſm with Water is underſtood; as where *Paul* ſaid, *Chriſt ſent me not to Baptize*; here we affirm, that to Baptize ſignifieth to Baptize with Water. But we ſay further, That the words Baptiſm and Baptize, when Water is not mentioned, do ſometimes ſignifie Water-baptiſm, and at other times not, but ſome other thing, as the Baptiſm of the Spirit, or the Baptiſm of Sufferings; as where Chriſt ſaid to two of his Diſciples, *Can ye be Baptized with my Baptiſm*; this was not Water-baptiſm, but the Baptiſm of his Sufferings whereof they were to be partakers.

And

And here in my Answer to *J. A.* his Arguments for Water-baptism, its being a Gospel Ordinance, it shall suffice to take notice, what is the principal defect of every one of them, and wherein he comes short in his proof as being meerly asserted, which therefore are to be returned unto him to be proved. In his first Argument he alledgeth, *That* John *the Baptist was the first Minister of the New Testament way of Dispensation*, for which he citeth, *Mat.* 11, 12, 13. *Luk.* 16. But these places prove no such thing, for they do not call him the first; and the words, *viz. The Law and the Prophets was unto* John; here *John* is the term inclusive in respect of the Law and Prophets, as if I should say *England* reaches from Lands end in *Cornwall* to *Berwick* upon *Tweed*; here *Berwick* is the term inclusive, and therefore it doth not follow, that it is any part of *Scotland*; again to say *Scotland* reacheth from *Berwick* to *Orknay*; here again *Berwick* is exclusive, in respect of *Scotland*; and therefore when it is said, *From* John, *the Gospel of the Kingdom is Preached.* It doth not inferr, that the Gospel began at *John* inclusively, but exclusively, even as *Scotland* begins at *Berwick* exclusively; for *John* was but a fore-runner of Christ, who himself began the Gospel Dispensation, in a peculiar way, and yet Christ also was subject to the

Law,

Law, for he was Circumciſed, and did Eat the Paſſover, both which were but Legal Adminiſtrations.

And here again, in the Proſecution of the firſt Argument *J. A.* abuſeth us, ſaying, *That we agree with* Papiſts *in affirming that Chriſts Baptiſm was ſubſtantially differing from the Baptiſm of* John. But his fallacy lyeth in this, that he doth not expreſs what the *Papiſts* mean by Chriſts Baptiſm; for they mean Water-Baptiſm, even as *J. A.* doth; but we ſay, the Baptiſm of Chriſt is not with Water, but with the Holy Ghoſt: Now we do not ſay as the *Papiſts*, *That there were two Baptiſms with Water, one of* John *another of Chriſt*; but only that *John's* Baptiſm with Water, and Chriſts Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt were diſtinct, even as *John* and Chriſt have expreſly diſtinguiſhed them. And therefore the ſecond Objection he inſtanceth *pag.* 69. doth not concern us.

As to his ſecond Argument, he taketh great pains to prove a thing which we no wiſe deny, *viz. That the Diſciples did Baptize divers with Water, after Chriſt his Aſcention, and his giving the Holy Ghoſt*; But it is the conſequence that is denyed by us, *viz.* That therefore Water-Baptiſm, is a Goſpel precept, for the Diſciples practiſed divers things after Chriſt his Aſcenſion, which were not

Goſpel

Gospel Precepts, for *Paul* Circumcised *Timothy* long after Christ his Ascention, also he purified himself after the manner of the Law, none of which were Gospel Precepts. And the Disciples did not only abstain from Blood and things Strangled, but enjoyned it unto others, the which Abstinance continued in the Church, even in *Tertullian*'s days, as is clear from his words; and *J. A.* doth not hold that to be a Gospel Precept, nor yet the Anointing with Oyl the Sick, nor the Washing one anothers Feet, both which were commanded and practised in the Primitive times. And this doth also sufficiently Answer his third Argument, from *Peter* his saying, *Repent and be Baptised*, if it were granted him, that Baptism with Water is there to be understood, for *Peter* might see it convenient at that time, for a help to their weakness, who were much used with outward Signs, to require it of them; which yet proveth not, that it is a Gospel Precept: For all Gospel Precepts reach further than unto Figures and Signs, which are but the shadows of Gospel Mysteries. And his fourth Argument hath the same defect with the former, that because *Peter* commanded *Cornelius* and others with him to be Baptized, that therefore it was a Gospel Precept; which doth no more follow, than that abstaining from Blood was commanded by the Apostles, that therefore

fore it is a Gospel Precept; or because Anointing the Sick with Oyl was commanded by *James*, that therefore it is a Gospel Precept.

And to his Fifth Argument, from *Eph.* 4. 5. that the one Baptism must be Water-Baptism, because that is the only proper Baptism, according to the signification of the word, whereas there is not one but many improper or Metaphorical Baptisms. But according to this reason of *J. A.* when in the same place *Paul* saith, *There is one Body*; Body doth not signifie the Church: for, to call the Church Body, is but improper and metaphorical; and there are many such metaphorical Bodies. Also when *Paul* saith, *There is one Spirit*, *J. A.* I suppose, doth know that Spirit, or as it is in the Greek πνεῦμα, doth not improperly and metaphorically signifie God, as much as Baptize signifieth inward Baptism, for the Grammatical signification of the word πνεῦμα, is Wind, and therefore if *J. A.* his consequence hold good; when the Apostle saith, *There is one Spirit*, that Spirit must be, in the Grammatical sense, *Wind*, that is a material thing, and not the Spirit of God, even as the Baptism must be a material or outward Baptism. And thus we may see, whether *J. A.* his blind way of drawing consequences doth lead him, even to the greatest impertinencies imaginable.

His

His sixth Argument from *Mark* 16. 16. hath this defect, that seeing the word *Baptised* cannot be meant of Conversion, or any other metaphorical Baptism, it must therefore be meant of Water-baptism. And it cannot be meant of Conversion, because of the order of the words, which requireth Faith to go before Baptism, whereas Faith cannot go before Conversion, because Faith is Conversion it self. I say his Argument hath this defect, that it confounds the part with the whole, for granting that Faith is Conversion in part, or in some degree; it doth not follow, that therefore it is the whole, or furthest degree of Conversion; for the work of Conversion, or Sanctification hath its several degrees, and that high or eminent degree of the Souls purification, which may be called its Baptism, or through plunging, is really posterior to the Souls first believing, and is the effect or consequence of it. Hence we read of purifying the heart by Faith, so as the purification is the effect and consequent of Faith. Again, whereas he laboureth to prove that the Baptism that saveth, which is mentioned, *1 Pet.* 3. 21. must be Water-baptism, because it is called the *Anti-type*, or thing signified, in respect of *Noah's* temporal saving by Water, and there must be some near resemblance betwixt a *Type* and its *Anti-type*, but he alledgeth

there

there is little or no resemblance betwixt *Noah's* temporal saving by Water, and the saving by the inward or Spiritual Baptism. But who is so blind or weak, that doth not see the falsehood of this his Assertion? Is there not the greatest and most near and infallible resemblance betwixt that temporal Salvation of *Noah* by Water, and the spiritual and eternal Salvation by the spiritual Baptism, which doth universally and infallibly save all Souls that are partakers of the said spiritual Baptism, whereas many thousands get the Water-baptism, who are not saved thereby? and therefore it doth much more naturally follow that not Water-baptism, but the Baptism of the Spirit that doth infallibly purifie the Soul is here meant, even as the inward Circumcision of the Spirit, is the *Anti-type*, or thing signified by outward Circumcision.

Lastly, As to his seventh Argument; whereas he laboureth to prove, *That Water-baptism is meant*, Matth. 28. 19, 20. whereof he is so confident, that he entreats his Reader, *Not to believe him henceforth, if he do not prove it so to be*; I shall briefly take his proof into consideration.

First, He says, *The* Greek *Word which is Translated* Teach, *signifies to make Disciples, and therefore they were to be made Disciples before they were to be Baptized; but they could*

not

not be made Disciples before Conversion, nor does Conversion pre-require Discipleship, or else no man might endeavour the Conversion of an Heathen, or of any man who is not before Hand a Disciple. To which I Answer, That granting the *Greek* word may signifie to make Disciples, yet all this reasoning of *J. A.* doth not inferr, that by Baptizing here, cannot be meant the Spiritual Baptizing, by the effusion of the Spiritual Water upon them, which, as is already said, signifies not barely the first or lowest degree of Conversion, but an high or eminent degree thereof, even as the outward Plunging or Dipping into Water, is more than a small Sprinkling. Now as true Faith is before this eminent degree of Conversion, or Purification, so is also true Discipleship: Nor doth it follow, that else no man might endeavour the Conversion of an Heathen; for they were to endeavour the full and perfect Conversion of Heathens, in the highest degree that was possible; but so as to do it in Gods way and order, to wit, first by Teaching and Disciphing them into the true Faith, and then their full and perfect Conversion, or Purification and Spiritual Cleansing, was to follow one degree after another.

His other reason is, *That the Baptism of Conversion, or the Spiritual cleansing of the Soul is but*

only improper and Metaphorical; and we must not throw about the words of any Text of Scripture, from a proper to an improper meaning, without some neceſſity conſtrain us ſo to do. To this I Anſwer, *Firſt*, That we ought not to go from the proper ſignification of any word, to an improper, without ſome urgent neceſſity, I already acknowledge. But then why doth *J. A.* and his Brethren frequently tranſgreſs this Rule in expounding other places of Scripture; as to inſtance when the Scripture ſaith, *Chriſt died for all men*, *J. A.* expoundeth this *all*, not of all individuals of mankind but only ſome, and theſe the far leſs number; and yet he muſt needs acknowledge, that the proper ſignification of the word *all*, is all individual. Again, when the Scripture ſaith, *Th' Kingdom of God is within you*, *J. A.* turneth it, *to among you*, contrary to the proper ſignification, and alſo to the common Tranſlation. Alſo when the Scripture ſpeaketh frequently of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit being in the Saints, they commonly ſay, *This is not to be meant properly, but figuratively underſtanding by Chriſt and the Spirit, the effects and operations or Graces of the Spirit, and not Chriſt or the Spirit himſelf*; And many inſtances of that nature can be given, to ſhew how *J. A.* and his Brethren go from the proper ſignification of Scripture words, to an improper,

without

without any neceſſity, unleſs that of their own deviſing.

But *Secondly*, *J. A.* doth but barely take it for granted, without any ſhadow of proof, that it is an improper meaning, to mean by the Baptiſm of Chriſt, the ſpiritual Baptiſm. For the proper meaning of any place or ſentence of Scripture, is certainly that meaning which the Spirit of God doth intend, whether there be a Metaphor uſed in that place or not. Nor doth the Metaphorical uſe of the word, hinder the meaning of it to be proper when it is ſo intended. And ſeeing the Scripture doth almoſt every where abound with Metaphors and metaphorical expreſſions, we are not ſo much to conſider, what is the bare Grammatical ſenſe of any word in common Speech, as what is the moſt common and uſual ſenſe of it in Scripture; for what is the moſt common ſenſe of it in Scripture I judge is the moſt proper meaning of it, whether the word be otherwiſe metaphorical or not; for who will deny, but according to Scripture ſenſe, by the word *Chriſt* is properly underſtood the true Chriſt of God, to wit, *His only begotten Son*; and yet Grammatically, it is but metaphorical; at leaſt, as much as the word *Baptize*, for *Chriſt* ſignifieth *Anointed*, even as *Baptized* ſignifieth *Waſhed* or *Dipped*; and if *J. A.* or any will contend, *That Chriſt*

is properly called Christ or Anointed, because the spiritual Anointing is as real and proper in its kind, as the outward and natural is in its kind; I shall not contend against them, but rather go along with them therein; but then I say also, that the *spiritual Baptism* is as real and proper in its kind, as the *spiritual Anointing* is in its kind; and thus also when Christ is called *Bread* in Scripture, in the Scripture sense, he is truly and properly called so; yea, why doth he call himself, *The true Bread*; and why said he that the *Manna* which *Moses* gave to the People in the *Wilderness*, was not the true *Bread* from *Heaven*. Doth not this signifie, that whatever vertue or excellency outward Bread hath to feed the Body Christ, who is the inward and spiritual Bread hath it much more to feed the Soul, yea, and the Body also, when he pleaseth so to do; and in this respect it is that some do affirm, *That those names of Bread, Water, Light, Oyl, and the like, are more properly applyed to the spiritual than to the natural: so that the Water, Oyl, Light and Bread, that is but outward and natural is rather metaphorically so called, and the inward and spiritual, more truly and properly deserving those names.* And thus the spiritual Baptism shall be the most proper in that sense also. But now let the Scripture be searched, and we shall find, that the word to *Baptize*,

doth

doth no less commonly signifie the spiritual Baptism, than the outward and Elementary; and therefore whoever would perswade us to believe that the spiritual Baptism is not meant here in *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. must shew some invisible necessity, why it ought not, the which *J. A.* hath not as yet done; and on the contrary we have good ground to believe, that the spiritual only is meant, because it is the spiritual Baptism only, which is called the Baptism of Christ in Scripture, and is expressly distinguished from the Baptism of *John* with Water; and certainly the Baptism which Christ commanded, was his own Baptism, whereof he gave the Apostles charge to administer it as servants and instruments under him, who made them Ministers of the Spirit and Power that was in him, by whose Ministry, others were partakers of the same. But if *J. A.* his Argument hold good, the spiritual Baptism is altogether excluded, and the Apostles received no Authority to Administer the Baptism of the Spirit, but only of Water, and consequently they were no Ministers of the Spirit; for how could they Minister of the Spirit, or the spiritual *Baptism*, unless they received Authority so to do; and where received they this Authority or Command; if not, when Christ said these words unto them. Again, if Christ had sent the Apostles to *Baptize*

tize with Water, then certainly he had sent *Paul* a Chief Apostle, but *Paul* said, *Christ sent him not to Baptize*, to wit, *with Water*. But whereas *J. A.* doth alledge, that *Paul* meaneth, *That Christ sent him not principally to Baptize*; I ask him, Why doth he transgress his own Rule, to go from the proper to the improper, and unusual signification of the word, not which is absolutely Negative, and not Comparative, and that without any urgent necessity, but that of his own meer devising; and that he saith, *Doubtless the Apostles did not Baptize without a Commission*; I Answer, this is barely asserted without proof, why might not *Paul* and others *Baptize* without a Commission, *to wit*, by a permission, as well as he did Circumcise, and did other things of the Law, and that without any imputation of Will-worship.

Having thus Answered *J. A.* his Arguments, I shall not need to answer his Objections, or pretended refutation of our Arguments, and that especially because some of them which he bringeth as our Arguments, are not really ours; and none of them he bringeth doth he fairly propose; and therefore I shall refer the Reader to our other Treatises, wherein our Arguments are more duly and fairly proposed, without repeating them here, because of Brevity. Only whereas he alledgeth,

ledgeth, we argue that Water-baptiſm is not meant, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. becauſe not expreſſed, I ſay, that *Baptiſm* with *Water* is not expreſſed, nor by any true and juſt conſequence is proved to be meant in *Matth.* 28. 19. and therefore we are not bound to believe that Water-baptiſm is there underſtood. And I hope the intelligent and impartial Reader may ſee, that *J. A.* hath not proved it to be ſo meant, by all his endeavours, and therefore not of his own mouth, henceforth he is not to be believed.

As concerning *J. A.* his Fourth Section, which is altogether concerning *Infant-Baptiſm*, I might wave it, becauſe it proceeds upon a bare Suppoſition that is not proved, *viz. That Water-Baptiſm is a Goſpel Precept.* And ſeeing the Controverſie is moſt proper betwixt him, and theſe called *Anabaptiſts*, wherein we are little concerned, I ſhall not inſiſt to Anſwer every thing, only I cannot but take notice of ſome of his moſt groſs and impertinent Aſſertions and Proofs.

He alledgeth Baptiſm under the New Teſtament is ſucceeded in the room of Circumciſion; to this I may reply in his own language elſewhere, *He putteth the Plough before the Oxen*, becauſe he ſuppoſeth ſtill a thing without proof, that Water-baptiſm is any New Teſtament Precept. Again he alledgeth,

That

That Baptiſm with Water is come in the room of Circumciſion, becauſe Paul *ſaith*, Col. 2. 11, 12. *Our burial with Chriſt in Baptiſm is our Circumciſion.* But he hath not proved that the Baptiſm, there mentioned, is Water-baptiſm; where is his conſequence for this? And why doth he expound the Circumciſion to be ſpiritual in that place; and the Baptiſm outward and viſible? Is it not more proper to take them both ſpiritually, and then his Argument doth wholly vaniſh? And I find, ask him, *Are all buried with Chriſt, who are Baptized with Water*; if he ſay *Not*, as he ought, then ſurely the Water-baptiſm, is not the Baptiſm there underſtood. Another Argument of his, is, *That becauſe the Infants of Believers are probably partakers of Regeneration, which is the thing ſealed or ſignified; that therefore they ought to be baptized with Water.* But this Argument proves as much, that Infants ſhould alſo have that called the Supper, becauſe Chriſt who was ſignified thereby, doth as probably belong to Infants as Regeneration, ſeeing none can have Regeneration without Chriſt, and I would know what *J. A.* doth ſay to this; or let him ſhew a reaſon why his Argument prove the one rather than the other. And it ſeems, that for that, or the like reaſon, *Auguſtine* and others of thoſe called the Fathers, were for giving that called

the

the Supper to Infants, as well as Water-baptiſm; and in that reſpect was long ago really adminiſtred to them.

But ſeeing *J. A.* hath ſpent ſo much Paper on Water-baptiſm, why ſaith he nothing to ſprinkling of Infants? why doth he not ſo much as attempt to prove that ſprinkling with Water, is, or ever was the true form of Baptiſm with Water, although the Queſtion doth expreſly mention it. Thus we ſee how all along hitherto, *J. A.* hath left the ſubſtance of the Queries unanſwered.

CHAP. IX.

BEfore my Anſwer to *J. A.* his pretended Survey of the Sixth Query, which is concerning that called the Sacrament of the Supper, I ſhall premiſe theſe few particulars: 1. That we do not deny but own and believe that all true Chriſtians and Believers do eat of Chriſt's body, and drink of his blood, and that beyond, or what is more than a figure or figurative Commemoration thereof, to wit, really and ſubſtantially, yet ſo as ſpiritually, and by Faith, and not outwardly and with the outward or bodily mouth. 2. Nor do

we

we deny, but that in all our Eatings and Drinkings, we are to remember the Lords Death, and so Eat with Holy Fear and Reverence, and Thankfulness. 3. And we deny not, but that the night wherein he was betrayed, he took Bread and brake it, after Supper, and having given Thanks, he gave it unto his Apostles, saying, *Take Eat this is my Body*, and likewise the Cup, saying, *Drink ye all of it, for as oft as ye Eate this Bread, and Drink this Cup, ye shew forth the Lords Death until he come:* So we grant, he gave them a Commandment to do the like for sometime to come: But that which is Queried is this, Where is it called a Gospel Ordinance, or standing Command of Christ unto the Worlds end, to Eat Bread and Drink Wine after Supper in a peculiar and solemn way of Commemoration, over and besides that which may and ought to be done every day? And whereas Christ said, *Do this in remembrance of his Death, till he come again.* It is Queried, Was this coming to the end of the World, or was it his coming to dwell in them? Now saith *J. A.* to all this, first he alledgeth, *It was a meer Circumstance, the doing of it at night, and after Supper, and so is no Essential part of the Action.* But he giveth no proof of this: And if men take a liberty to change one Circumstance, why may they not change

all

all the reſt as well as that one. As for Example, why may they not ſay, that Bread of Wheat, and the Wine, are but Circumſtances alſo, ſeeing Eating and Drinking may be without either Wheat or Wine, as well as it may be any other time, then at Night. Again, why may it not be ſaid, that the whole Action is but a Circumſtance in reſpect of the thing principally intended, which was to ſignifie our Spiritual Eating and Drinking of Chriſt his Body and Blood; which may be very well without the outward Eating and Drinking, as all Proteſtants do generally acknowledge; and thus the outward Eating and Drinking is but a Circumſtance, as well as the time: And ſurely the time doth ſeem no leſs to have ſignification, than the Eating and Drinking it ſelf had, to wit, that it was at Night; for that time when Chriſt ſuffered was the Evening, or laſt part of the Covenant Diſpenſation, wherein he gave them a Sign or Figure ſuitable to that preſent Diſpenſation, and was not to continue as a binding thing, after the Goſpel day or Diſpenſation ſhould clearly break up, or be diſperſed. And it doth plainly enough appear, that in the primitive times, they who uſed that Solemnity, they laid weight upon the circumſtance of the time, doing it at Night, and after Supper; which came in proceſs of time to be changed, to the

doing

doing of it in the Morning, or before Dinner? And if Christ had not intended some weighty signification by the Circumstance of time, to wit, at Night, and after the Passover, I see not, why that circumstance of time is so carefully set down by the *Evangelists*. Hence from the very Circumstance of time, I bring an Argument, that what Christ did at that time, and bid his Disciples do, until he came, is no Gospel Ordinance, because it was done in the Night or Evening of the Old Covenant Dispensation, and consequently was to come to an end with it. Although for the weakness of some, it was continued for a time in the Primitive Church after the Night of the Old Covenant was expired, and the day of the Gospel Dispensation was clearly broke up: And another Argument we have, that the outward Bread and Wine is but a Figure of Christs Flesh and Blood, and not his real Body, as all Protestants acknowledge, and consequently is no Gospel Ordinance, which consists not in the Figures, Types and Shaddows, that were proper to the Law, but in the things signified by them. Again, whereas *J. A.* doth alledge, *That Christ commanded it to be done*, It is granted, he commanded it for that time, and for some time to come, until the darkness of the legal Dispensation should clearly vanish, and be dispelled from the

Eyes

Eyes of the Disciples, which was not suddenly done, but required a time: And many that did truly believe in Christ, were but weak, and could not easily be weaned from the observation of outward Figures and Types; and therefore Christ gave them thus for some time to condescend to their weakness, to bring them off from the Law, and the Figures, Types and Shaddows thereof by degrees, as they were able to bear. But it doth not follow, that because Christ commanded it unto them, for that time, or sometime following, that therefore it is a Gospel Ordinance, seeing he commanded them as expressly divers other things, which *J. A.* and his Brethren acknowledge are no Gospel Ordinances, *As the washing one anothers Feet*; also, *That they should go and tarry at* Jerusalem *for certain days, and wait for the Promise of the Father.* And he bid them, *Provide neither Bag, nor Shoes, nor Money, when they went forth to Preach:* But I suppose none of all these will *J. A.* or his Brethren plead to be Gospel Ordinances. And even as his commanding them to tarry at *Jerusalem* until they received the Promise of the Father; which was the Spirit, (to wit, in greater measure than formerly it was given unto them) did not oblige them to stay longer: So his commanding them to use that solemn and peculiar com-

commemoration of his Death, until he should come, did not oblige them longer, than until that his coming. But now the Question is, What coming did Christ mean, whether his last coming at the end of the World, or his Spiritual coming to dwell in them, and feed with his real Flesh and Blood Spiritually received, which is more than the Figure? We say it is his Spiritual coming in his Saints; but *J. A.* and his Brethren say, *It is his outward coming*, which yet he hath not proved, for all his wrangling. And instead of proving what he saith, he not only abuseth us with bad words, as calling us, *Possest with a blind and deaf Spirit*; but most falsly alleadgeth on us, that we hold, *Christ did not dwell in his Apostles, before that time, when Christ took the Bread:* For we say no such thing, nor is any thing of that sort insinuated in the Queries: Only, *That Christ did promise unto them, that he would come and dwell in them*, to wit, in a more abundant measure, and clearer way of manifestation, suitable to the Gospel Dispensation, than formerly they witnessed under the Law. Nor will this argue that either the Apostles were wholly unconverted, or unregenerated at that time; all this is but the bare imagination of *J. A.* his Brain, and no just or true consequence from our words. And whereas *J. A.* Querieth, *Did not Christ dwell*

in

in these Corinthians *whom* Paul *writes to.*
Answer, he did in some measure, but yet in diverse of them, he did not dwell in that measure or manner of clear manifestation, as was promised; for *Paul* said unto them, *He could not write unto them as spiritual, but as carnal, and he fed them with milk, and not with meat*; which plainly imports that many of them was short of that measure and degree of Spirituality, which the pure Gospel state required. And as for 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24. which *J. A.* bringeth to prove, *That the outward Eating is a Gospel Institution*; I Answer, that place, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24. contains no Institution of it at all, but only an Historical relation of what Christ did and said that night to his Disciples. Not did *Paul* say, that he received a Command from the Lord, or delivered a command unto them, concerning *Bread* and *Wine*; but that which he received and delivered unto them from the Lord was, the knowledge of what the Lord did and said at that time. And though this practise was continued in the Church of *Corinth* for that time, and perhaps in other Churches, this proves it not to be a Gospel Ordinance more than Water-baptism, or Circumcision, both which were practised by many that did believe in those times.

And here again *J. A.* falls into his old trade of falsly accusing us, as being against all external Ordinances, because the Query insinuates, *That such who are come into Death with Christ, need not Bread and Wine to put them into remembrance of his Death*; from whence he most unjustly inferreth his consequence, that we reject all outward helps and means whatsoever. But doth not *J. A.* know that his own brethren acknowledge there is no absolute necessity of using that called the Supper, so as none can be saved but such as partake of it; and the like may be said of any outward helps, when people cannot have them. But yet we say still, whatever outward thing God hath Commanded us to use, be it never so small or mean, is in that respect both necessary and profitable unto us, for there is none of God's Commands, but they bring along with them a real advantage to mens Souls; but *J. A.* hath not as yet proved it, that using *Bread* and *Wine*, as aforesaid, is any Gospel Command. Another abuse of his is, that he alledgeth, *We reject the said practise of taking the Bread and Wine, from a conceited perfection*; which is false, for as we do not boast of our perfections, so we do not reject that custom, because of any perfection, that some of us may become unto beyond others, but because we cannot find it to be any Gospel Precept;

sepo; and therefore we cannot acknowledge it either to be necessary or profitable to the weakest.

Another thing he quarrelleth in the Query is, *That it makes to dye with Christ, and to come to the Death with him all one.* And here he insults not a little in his knowledge of Philosophy above the *Quakers*, for a meer *Grammaticism* of saying *to* for *into*, which perhaps was only a fault in the Transcriber; and yet we find commonly that *to* and *into* are indifferently used to signifie one thing: as *to* come to Town, is all one as to come *into* it; and *to* come to Christ, is all one as to come *into* him; and when Christ said, *Come unto me*, he did certainly mean that they were to come *into* him. Hence we read of the Saints being in Christ. And if this be *J. A.* his Philosophy so to quarrel at words proper enough, and according to Scripture, let the judicious and sober Reader judge, whether some of our Friends that called his Philosophy, Poolosophy, had not ground so to do. And whether he has not discovered more folly than true Philosophy, from first to last, in his Book against us.

In his Answer to the reason hinted in the Query from *Paul's* words, to seek the things that are above, and the things that are seen are temporal, he still beggeth the Question,

That the outward observation of Bread and Wine, is a mean which God hath appointed, for the attaining the things above. And in Opposition to his *Assertion*, let him read what *Paul* saith, *Col.* 2. 17. where he putteth meat and drink in together with the new Moons, and other legal Observations, which he calleth, *A shadow of things to come*; but the body is of Christ. And seeing *J. A.* acknowledgeth that the *Bread* and *Wine* are but external signs, and not the real body of Christ; I ask him, wherein then differ they from *Shadows*. And if they be *Shadows*, they are no part of the Gospel Dispensation, according to *Paul*'s Doctrine.

In the close of his pretended Survey to this Sixth Query, he chargeth us most rashly and uncharitably, as being related to the accuser of the Brethren, as if the writer of the Queries had positively charged all the Ministers of *Scotland*, that they never intended their Hearers should come any nearer to Christs Death, than a bare Historical remembrance thereof. But doth not *J. A.* know, that to Query a thing is one, and positively to conclude it, far another. And the Enquirer had ground so to Query, because he understands, that if it were the care of Preachers to bring people into the Death with Christ, so as to be Crucified with him, they would not plead so much

much for upholding a Figure or Shadow of Christ's Death, to put them in remembrance of it; when to suffer and die with Christ is much more effectual to remember them. Nor *Secondly*, would they plead so much for carrying a body of sin about with them, while they live, and that all must be under a necessity of sinning daily in Thought, Word, and Deed; yea, in whatever they think, speak, or do, for such a state is not consistent with a being Dead and Crucified with Christ. And *Thirdly*, If it were their work to bring people to dye with Christ, they would turn them to the Light of Christ in their Hearts, and Preach it to be unto them of a saving Nature, and an effectual mean to obtain the said Death with Christ, which yet they do not, but on the contrary deny it as meerly natural insufficient. And is it not too apparent that the far greatest number of your Church Members, know nothing more of Christ's Death than the History of it? And whether the fault of this lye not in a very great part upon the Preachers, is no small nor impertinent Question.

And seeing *J. A.* pretends so much to Scripture Rule, I shall ask him a few Queries more upon the former Head.

First, *What Scripture hath he and his Brethren to call that eating of Bread and drinking of Wine, once or twice in a year, in the Publick Assembly, the Sacrament?*

2. *What Scripture have they to instruct them how oft they should use it, as once, twice, or four times in every year? And if they have none, was it not then left to people according to the Query, at least as to the time?*

3. *What Scripture have they for consecrating it, or when did Christ say, Before ye eat it, consecrate it?*

4. *When did Christ give only the power to a Priest or Presbyter, or Ordained Minister to Consecrate it, so as without the said Consecration by some Priest, or Ordained Minister, it is no Sacrament? And seeing every Christian may eat it as well as the Minister, why may he not also consecrate it, as well as he, seeing every true Christian is a Priest?*

5. *Where did Christ appoint, that these words,* Take Eat, this is my body, *should be the words of consecration, and have ye not received all this from the Papists, and not from Christ?*

6. *Seeing ye commonly say, that this Sacrament of the Supper is come in the room of the Passover, and under the Law, every Family had power without a Priest, to celebrate the Passover; why hath not also every Family under the Gospel as much power, without any Ordained Priest or*

Mi-

Minister to celebrate that called the Supper?

7. Seeing every true Christian feeds daily by Faith upon the body of Christ, according to the Protestant Doctrine, and ought daily to remember the Death of Christ, in all their eating and drinking, which is also sanctified unto them by the Word of God and Prayer, what peculiar vertue or efficacy hath your sacramental eating, more than ordinary eating; when done, with godly Fear, Prayer and Thanksgiving, and remembring the Lords Death?

8. Seeing it is clear from Luke 22. 17, 18, 19, 20. that Christ did take the cup twice; once before he gave them the bread, and once after, bidding them do the same; why take ye the cup but once? was this only a bare circumstance?

9. Is not the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 10. 15, 16, 17. to be understood of quite another Bread and Cup, than that which is visible and outward, when he saith, I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say (did he not say this because he was to speak of the Bread and Cup, in the mysterie, as it was altogether a spiritual and invisible thing, to wit, the real body and blood of Christ spiritually received, which none but the spiritually wise could understand) The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one Bread, for

we are all partakers of that one Bread. Is it not clear from all this, that Paul *speaks not of any visible and corruptible Bread but of Christ himself, as he is spiritually and invisibly received by Faith whom he calls the same spiritual meat and drink, which the Fathers received of old? see the same Chapter,* Verse 3, 4.

10. *Do any receive the Supper of the Lord, or Sup with the Lord, but such as open to him and hear his voice, according to* Rev. 3. 20. *And is not this Supper, or Supping with the Lord, altogether inward, spiritual and invisible.*

Now whereas *J. A.* doth alledge that the Querist hath mistaken the second Epistle of *Paul* to the *Corinthians* for the first, because he citeth these words in the second Epistle, *For the things that are seen, are but temporal, but the things which are not seen, are eternal;* I Answer, that the Apostle *Paul* writeth to the same purpose, in the first Epistle, and that much more clearly, calling Christ the spiritual Meat and Drink, as he is spiritually and invisibly received by Faith.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

J. A. in his pretended Survey of the seventh Query, (which is concerning the Sabbath-day) alledgeth; *That the fourth Commandment requireth, to keep Holy unto God one day of seven; and seeing that fourth Commandment is Moral, it extends to all Ages of the World.* But in Answer to this, as that the fourth Commandment required one day in seven, so it expresly mentions that day to be the seventh, and not any one other of the seven; for the said fourth Commandment did plainly bind the *Jews* to the seventh day, which was not lawful for them to change to the first. And whereas *J. A.* alledgeth, *That the Accomodation to the particular time, or Diet to the last day of the Week is indeed Abrogated, but not the substance of the Command.* By this he quite overturneth his former Assertion, *That the fourth Commandment was simply Moral*; for if it was simply Moral, nothing of the least Circumstance of it could be Abrogated. But some of *J. A.* his Brethren are more wary and considerate, who say, *The fourth Commandment was partly Moral, and partly Ceremonial:* The Cere-

Ceremonial part of it was, that it tyed to the seventh day; the Moral part of it was, and is partly that it requires some competent time to be appointed for the Worship of God, both private and publick, laying aside all Worldly occasions for that time, as well out of our Minds as hands, without tying to any limited day of seventh or sixth: And partly again in respect of its Spiritual signification; for the outward Sabbath of the *Jews*, was a Type or Shadow of Christ, in whom all True Believers find rest to their Souls, from all their heavy Labours and Toils; and that Christ is the thing signified by the Sabbath, is clear from *Coloss.* 2. 16, 17. Again that neither *J. A.* nor his Brethren hold the first day of the Week, in that strictness of a Sabbath, as the fourth Commandment required is clear, because the said fourth Commandment required, *That in it they should not do any work*, which elsewhere in Scripture is more particularly set down, *That they were not to kindle a Fire on the Sabbath; and he that gathered sticks on the Sabbath-day was to be stoned to Death.* All which proveth that the Sabbath of the *Jews* was Typical, and consequently that the Morality of it, was principally its Spiritual signification, as it did hold forth Christ, no less than the other Types and Figures. But *J. A.* alloweth people to kindle a Fire on

that

that day, and to Boil and Roast Meat as plentifully as on other days, if he be of his Brethrens mind, who commonly Feast on that day, and have a larger Table than at other times. And although *J. A.* undertake the Vindication of the Church in *Britain*, yet he cannot be ignorant, that the greatest part of his Episcopal Brethren were and are of another mind, *viz. That the keeping of the First day of the Week is no Moral Command*; else they would never have allowed Playes and Markets to be kept on that day. And *Calvin*, whose Opinions *J. A.* followeth but too much in other things did not hold, *That the keeping of the first day, was any Command of God, but simply that the Church had agreed to it to meet on that day:* And he saith plainly, *They might have chused another day as well as that.*

Now the Query saith, *That the Saints did meet together*, this is Scripture; so we acknowledge that the Saints did meet together on the first day of the Week, and so we do according to their example; and also we acknowledge that some considerable part of our life time is to be set apart for the solemn Worship and Service of God; and this not only the Scripture Testimony, but the Law of God in our hearts doth require. And we further judge, that rather more of our time is to be given to the Service of God, solemnly set

apart

apart from all worldly occasions now under the *New Testament*, (and that Servants and Beasts may have rest, for God requireth that mercy be shewn to them also) than was formerly under the Law, by vertue of the fourth Commandment. And therefore we have Meetings, and other times of Retirement, at other times of the Week, than on the first day. As also we do generally abstain from Bodyly Labour on the first day of the Week, although we cannot call it the Christian Sabbath, for that were to put it in the room of Christ: But what abuse and profanity is it to pretend to set apart a day only for the Service of God, and yet to spend it worse, than any other day of the Week, for most part, to wit, in Idle Communications, Playes, and Drinking, as too many of *J. A.* his Brethren openly do.

And now let us see further, what *J. A.* doth alledge for the first day of the Week, its being appointed to be kept for a Sabbath.

One Argument is, *That because Christ rose on that day, and honoured it with his most frequent appearings, after his Resurrection on that day, that therefore he appointed it to be kept for a Sabbath:* But this inference is without any proof, and is therefore returned to him: And it is manifest, that at a certain time, when Christ did appear, some of the Disciples

ciples were Fishing with their Nets, *Joh.* 21. And if that was the first day of the Week, and appointed by Christ for a Sabbath, how was it that the Disciples did so openly transgress it, and yet were not reproved by Christ, but were bidden cast out the Net by himself. Nor is his other Argument of any greater weight, *That because the Primitive Christians, in the Apostles times and downwards, did constantly meet on that day, and had their Collections for the poor, that therefore it was appointed to be strickly observed as a Sabbath*: This consequence is also returned upon him, as barely alledged without proof. And both we and many other Protestants in *France* and *Holland*, constantly meet on that day; and yet it doth not follow, that we or they hold it for a Sabbath, for many of them do not, any more than we.

Another Argument of his is, *Because it is called the Lords day*, Rev. 1. 10. To which I Answer *J. A.* hath not as yet proved it evidently, that by the Lords day there is meant the first day of the Week, but giving it, that *John* meant the first day, as I find generally that *Justine Martyr* and others about his time did call the first day of the Week, the Lords day; yet it doth not follow, that therefore the Lord appointed it to be kept as a Sabbath, for it might well enough be called the Lords day

day, because he arose upon it, for many days have received Names for much less reason according to the Ancient Tradition in Old times, which not being in Scripture is not so certain to us, as that other, *viz. Of Christ his Resurrection day.*

Another Argument of his is, *Because that Christ Taught the Disciples to Pray that their flight might not be on the Winter, nor on the Sabbath day, when he Prophecied of the Destruction of* Jerusalem, *Math.* 24. 20. But to this I Answer, That the Name of Sabbath doth not infer, that any outward day is to be kept for a Sabbath, under the *New Testament*, more than the Name of Circumcision doth infer that there is now to be any outward Circumcision; and what Christ spoke to the Disciples, it was not to them alone, but to all the *Jews*, who as he did well know, would still be Zealous for the *Jewish* Sabbath, after his Resurrection: As indeed they were, and also for Circumcision; and therefore he knew what great an Affliction it would be to them to be put to flee on that day; and accordingly we find, that not only them, but long after the *Jews*, even many of them that believed, and also our Christians, did observe the *Jewish* Sabbath, and some observed both, that and also the first day, until *Constantine*'s time. What Christ therefore spoke of the

Sabbath

Sabbath, was not to confirm them, to keep either that or the first day of the Week for a Sabbath, but to expres the great Affliction, they would be in, if they should flee on that day, which they so much did regard. And beside, some understand the Sabbath here also by way of Allegory, which *J. A.* hath not refused.

And whereas the said *J. A.* alledgeth, that *Rom.* 14. 5, 6. *Is not to be understood of the first day of the Week, but only of other* Jewish *days*: This is meerly alledged, without any shadow of proof, for no where doth *Paul*, or any other Pen-man of the Scripture make an exception of the first day. And therefore seeing *Rom.* 14. speaks of days indefinitely, the first day is understood as well as the rest.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

IN the pretended Survey of the eighth Query, which is concerning Singing of Psalms, *J. A.* is at much pains to prove a thing, which we do not deny, *viz. That Singing of Psalms, is allowed and commanded under the* New Testament: For this we willingly acknowledge, and those who can Sing with the Spirit and understanding, they may use either *David's* words, or words of any other Holy men, recorded in Scripture, or any other sound words, as the Lord shall move them: But all this is no Answer to the Question, which is not concerning Singing only or simply, but that way of Singing used by *J. A.* and his Brethren, without any pretence to an immediate direction, or motion of the Spirit Infallibly Teaching or assisting them what and how to Sing. Now the Query is, where doth he find such Singing Warranted in Scripture, *viz.* without the Spirit infallibly directing them. 2. Their Singing with Meeter or Tooting Rhymes, Artificially compoſed by meer Natural Art and Industry; where is such Singing commanded or practised

sed in Scripture. And 3. it is Queried since the Apostles did not turn them into Meeter, why have others since them, done so, as if they were more wise than the Apostles, or saw further what God required of them. And whereas *J. A.* alledgeth, *That Psalms cannot be Sung, except they be Meetered*; If he mean by Meetering, putting them in Tooting Rhymes, or Rhymes ending with the like Cadencies and Sounds, he sheweth his great ignorance in Poetry, and Musick; for the best Poesies are without any such Cadencies: Nor have *David's* Psalms any such Cadencies of like sounds at the end of the Lines, as they are written in *Hebrew*. And although *Davids* Psalms are Penned with certain measures of Words and Sentences, yet that was by some Divine Skill, which the Spirit of the Lord Taught him, and not by bare humane Art, as I suppose *J. A.* will not deny.

But another great abuse in *J. A.* is, that he excuseth wicked and proud mens Singing such words of *David* as these: *I am not puft up in mind, I water my Couch with my Tears*, &c. alledging they may be Sung as well as Read by such men. But who cannot see the absurdity of this inference, for to Read, and to Pray, and also to Sing, are very differing; and one may Read the Devils words, and the words of the wickedest men Recorded in

Scripture; but when one Prayeth, or Praiſeth, he expreſſeth ſomewhat of his own condition. And men may read the Creed or Ten Commands, but yet they are not proper for a Prayer, and the moſt of the Pſalms are Prayers.

But laſtly, whereas *J. A.* ſaith, *He and his Brethren have the ſame Spirit the Apoſtles had, though not the ſame meaſure:* We may not unfitly Query them, how he can prove or demonſtrate this to us, ſeeing ſome of his Brethren have asked a proof from us, that we had the ſame Spirit: And if *J. A.* be in good earneſt, and doth indeed believe that he has the ſame Spirit, which the Apoſtles had, how is it that he doth ſo very frequently mock and ſcoff at the Infallible Inſpiration of the Spirit, which we plead for, as the common priviledge of all true Chriſtians. And was not the Spirit which the Apoſtles had, the Infallible Spirit? And if *J. A.* thinks he has the ſame Spirit, either he muſt needs acknowledge, that he has the Infallible Spirit, and is ſo far infallible, or then he muſt ſay, that the Spirit of God is changed, ſo that whereas it was Infallible in the Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians, it is become Fallible in *J. A.* and his Brethren. And if he have the ſame Spirit, which the Apoſtles had, but in the leaſt meaſure, how is it that he hath ſaid above that

the

the Dictate of the Spirit within is worthy of a thousand Deaths? Let *J. A.* extricate himself of these contradictions if he can. And further I ask *J. A.* whether the Psalms, he and his Brethren Sing in their Meetings, be these Spiritual Songs, which the Primitive Christians did Sing; and such as we Read of particularly in the Church of *Corinth*, where Psalms are reckoned among the other peculiar Gifts of the Spirit, such as Revelations and Interpretations; where it is manifest, that the whole Assembly did not all Sing the same words with their voice; but every one did Sing as they received it from the Lord, and as he did put it into their Hearts; and such were the Songs of *Zachariah*, *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, who Sung and Blessed the Lord by the Holy Ghost. And seeing *J. A.* saith, *That they cannot Sing, unless what they Sing, be turned into Meeter*, I ask him, whether the Songs of *Zachariah*, *Mary* and *Elizabeth* were Sung by them in Meeter, or Rhyme, and with Musical Dittyes and Tunes Artificially Composed, or whether they had a Precentor, or any that went before them. And whether such kind of Officers were in the Church in the time of the Apostles, as Precentors that went before the people: And whom they were all to follow, accordingly as he Sang after this or that Tune of Musick Artificially Com-

posed. Or rather have ye not Learned all this from the Papists? And was it not *Guido Aretinus*, a Popish Monk, that invented the Scale of Musick commonly called the Gamut according to which the Precentors are Learned to Raise the Psalms. All which is but the bare Act of Man; and such who plead for Vocal Musick in the Church, from the example of *David*, and the Law; they may also on the same account plead for the use of Musical Instruments in the Church; not only as lawful, but as necessary, (which yet the Episcopal Church here wanteth) and not only so, but Dancing also, as a part of Divine Worship, which was used in time of the Law, and especially by *David*. And thus by *J. A.* his Argument, both Instrumental Musick, and Dancing shall be necessary parts of Gospel Worship.

And as concerning wicked mens Singing, it is most clear, that as they are not to Pray, while remaining wicked, so nor are they to Sing, because all true Singing is a real part of Divine Worship, which is to be done in Spirit and Truth; but no wicked nor unrenewed person can so do. And seeing all wicked persons professing Christianity, are Captives in Spiritual *Babylon*, how can they Sing any of the Songs of *Zion* in a strange Land? Can they Sing that new Song, which

the

the Redeemed from the Earth Sing? *Rev.* 14. was not the Lord displeased with their Singing even under the Law, when the people did degenerate and become perverse? And did he not threaten that he would turn the Songs of their Temple into Howlings? And yet according to *J. A.* the most perverse and abominable corrupted persons, may and ought to Sing Psalms: But what Harmony can such Singing make in the Ears of the Lord, while the Heart is so discordant to the Law of God? And although *J. A.* hath his best and greatest Patrons, for his Musical Singing, with Artificial Dittyes, and Tunes, and Rhymes out of the Popish Church; as also for his pleading that wicked persons may Sing *David's* words, without making a Lye; I shall here Cite a very fair acknowledgement out of a late Popish Writer, to the Truth of what we alledge against *J. A.* The which Writer is *Johannes Bona* in his Book called, *The Principles of the Christian Life*, Part 1. Sect. 44. *They are Lyes* (saith he) *and empty words, when any committeth wickedness; and singeth in a Psalm unto God: I have hated iniquity, and abominated it*, Psal. 118. *He that is altogether in his Dishes, and saith, I have forgot to Eat my Bread*, Psal. 101. 1. *He Laugheth the whole day, and exceedeth in vain joy, and saith, my Tears were my Bread day and night; he*

obeyeth not the Commandments, and he Sinneth They are Curſed who decline from thy Commandments, Pſal. 118. *Such Prayers* (ſaith he) *are Accurſed, provoking the wrath of God, toward ſuch, and they deſerve to be puniſhed with ſevere Pains.* Now albeit this Teſtimony is from a *Papiſt*, I hope no Sober perſon will call it a *Popiſh* Doctrine, but rather a Chriſtian Truth, which the Evidence of Truth hath extorted from him. And it is a ſhame that *J. A.* ſhould be more blind, who pretends to more knowledge.

CHAP. XII.

J. *A.* in his pretended Survey of the *9th*, *10th*, and *11th*. Queries, doth ground his Diſcourſe ſo much partly upon miſtakes, and partly upon barely ſuppoſed alledged principles, which he doth not prove, that I ſhall need to ſay very little directly in Anſwer to the whole, from his *pag.* 119, to *pag.* 131. only ſome of his moſt conſiderable miſtakes and bare Suppoſitions, I ſhall take notice of, the which being denyed, and removed, his whole Superſtructure falls of it ſelf.

Firſt,

First, He blames the Querieſt, or Writer of the Queries, *For falſly accuſing the or ſlandering the Church in* Brittain, as he calleth it, *as if they did hold their Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions formally, as ſuch, for an Infallible Rule, and their Catechiſms and Confeſſions of Faith equal to the Scriptures.* But I Anſwer, the Query maketh no mention of thoſe terms [formally as ſuch.] But ſimply whether they hold their *Directory Confeſſion of Faith and Catechiſm*, to be an Infallible Rule, and equal to the Scripture. Again, *Secondly*, what is propoſed in the Query is not poſitively concluded one way or another, as the Nature of a Query doth plainly demonſtrate. And yet *Thirdly*, he plainly affirmeth, *pag.* 129. *That the whole Articles and Difinitions contained in the Catechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith materially conſidered, are very Goſpel Rule, and Scripture Sentence, either expreſly and formally, or materially, implicitely and by good conſequence taught therein.* How then can he have any face to accuſe the Inquirer, for asking ſuch a thing which he doth openly acknowledge. And here let the Reader take notice, that the *Catechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith*, whereof *J. A.* giveth ſo great a Commendation, is not that of the Epiſcopal Church, but the *Presbyterian, viz.* that made by the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*,

which is expresly cited by him, *cap.* 31. *art.* 4. it is not then as seemeth the Defence of the *Episcopal* Church and Faith, that *Joh. Alexander* undertaketh, but the *Presbyterian*, and yet *J. A.* is a Member of the *Episcopal* Church, and Officiates therein under *John Hamilton*, an *Episcopal* Preacher, who hath recommended his Book, at the Order of the Bishop of *Edenburgh*. But I suppose the *Episcopal* Church in *Brittain* will give *John Alexander*, or his Patriot *John Hamilton* little Thanks for his Service, seeing many *Episcopal* Teachers in *Brittain* differ widely in Doctrin from the said *Westminster Confession*. And had *J. A.* no other *Confession of Faith*, or *Catechism* to commend, but that of the *Presbyterians*, whom his *Episcopal* Brethren commonly call *Fanaticks*; and is it turned to that, that they commend their *Confession of Faith*, as the only Confession of the Church in *Brittain*? But I can find no mention in the said Confession, that *Episcopacy* is *Jure Divino*.

However since *J. A.* has undertaken the defence of the *Presbyterian* Church and Faith, in all its Articles and Definitions, *as very Gospel Rule, and Scripture Sentence*, he must then acknowledge that all these Definitions and Articles of his *Presbyterian* Brethren, are at least materially considered, infallible Oracles. And seeing he confesseth they are not all expresly

preſly contained in Scripture, but many of them only deduced by conſequence therefrom, by what infallible conſequence can he convince any rational man, that his and their conſequences are juſt and right ſince he laies no claim to the leaſt meaſure of that kind of direction of the Holy-Spirit, teaching him and his Brethren to draw thoſe conſequences, which Chriſt and the Apoſtles had, whereby they argued, and did draw conſequences from places of Scripture formerly writ. And ſeeing not only Papiſts and Proteſtants, but the Epiſcopal and Presbyterian draw contrary conſequences from the Scriptures, what evidence can *J. A.* give us, why we ſhould receive the conſequences of the one more than the other. Or can we think the Lord hath left his people ſo in the dark, as to give no other knowledge of his Will in a great many things, which are Articles of Faith, but what can be ſearched out by long and tedious conſequences, of the bare natural underſtanding of man, as it is left to it ſelf, to fiſh and hunt in the dark, after ſuch conſequences, without any ſuch ſpecial direction and conduct of the Holy Spirit, in the leaſt meaſure, which Chriſt and the Prophets and Apoſtles had. Nay I do not find that *J. A.* doth acknowledge ſo much as the leaſt abſolute neceſſity of any ſort of operation or illumination of the Spirit, ſo much

such as that they call effective or subjective, in order to draw their consequences from the Scripture. But if this way of drawing consequences without the help of the Holy Spirit were so safe and sure, how is it then that so many of all sorts draw contrary consequences from the same Scriptures? Is not the great reason of all this, because men are departed from that holy Spirit, which gave forth the Scriptures, and can only give the true understanding of them? And therefore is it not plain and manifest, as the Light at Noon-day, that man's natural Spirit, and Reason, and Wisdom, in its highest perfection, is altogether unable to meddle with Divine Truths, or to search after them, as it remains alone, hunting in the dark. And certainly this is no small part of that cursed self-conceit and exaltation of mind, that Rules in the degenerated nature of man, that they think they can be wise enough without God's Spirit, they need no direction, or assistance, or illumination to help them to search into the Scriptures, they can do that well enough with their natural reason, and a little School-craft of Artificial Logick, and Grammar, and Natural Philosophy; but that blessed man *David* was of another mind, when he prayed unto the Lord, saying, *Open my Eyes, that I may see the wonderful things of thy Law.* And as for consequences which men

draw

draw, as they are directed and taught by the Spirit of God, as Christ and the Apostles were, when they drew any consequence from what was formerly writ, we do own them, and receive them, and none else. But yet as to the most weighty and necessary things, to wit, such as are the general principles of the Christian Faith and Doctrine, and which as such are generally to be received by all Christians, as well these of the meanest capacity, as others of the greatest, we see the Lord hath not left it to mans industry, to search after them by consequences long or short, but hath delivered them to us in plain expreſs words and terms, and that many times over and over again (as in respect of many of them) in the Holy Scriptures. And why is it, that the Scriptures are so full and large in their Testimony to the Doctrines and Principles of Religion, but to let us understand, that all the Principles and Doctrines of the Christian Faith, which God requireth in common of all Christians are expresly their delivered and recorded, and put as it were in a puplick Register. And therefore, for my part, what I cannot find expresly delivered in Scripture, I see no reason why I should receive or believe it as any common Article or principle of the Christian Faith or Life; and for such, to whom God hath given that Divine skill to

Dive,

...ive, or dip into the depth of the Scriptures, ...r out of the reach of other men, who may ...e true Christians, so as to collect or gather by just and true consequences, other things that lie out of the view of their weaker Brethren, they ought not to obtrude them upon any to be received as principles of Faith, but in that case to have Faith to themselves, and receive them as peculiar discoveries or Revelations of the Spirit to them, and such others as God hath so enlightened; the which by the Apostle *Paul* is called, *The Word of Wisdom*, to wit, such a peculiar degree of Wisdom or Understanding in the depth of the Scriptures, as others who yet were true Christians did not reach unto; and concerning such a peculiar gift of Divine Wisdom, he said, *We speak Wisdom among the perfect*: this certainly could be no common Article of Faith, else he should have Preached it to all. And this by the same Apostle is elsewhere called, *The knowledge of Mysteries*, as distinguished from the common Faith and knowledge of the whole Church. Now if this were but received among those called Christians, that nothing should be required by one sort from another, as an Article of Faith, or Doctrine or principle of the Christian Religion in common to be believed, but what is expresly delivered in the Scriptures, in plain expres Scripture terms, of how great

an

an advantage might it be to bring a true reconcilement among them, and beget true Christian Unity, Peace, Love and Concord. And as for the consequential part of peculiar Doctrines, whether true or false, to leave every one a freedom or latitude, without imposing upon them the affirmative or negative, as any bond or tye of Christian fellowship; for if such consequential Doctrine be false, it is most unreasonable to impose it, and therefore in that Case, a Dissenter should have his liberty to differ in judgment, without any breach of Brotherly Unity and Society; and if it be true, yet not being opened or revealed to another, it cannot be in justice pressed or urged upon him, where God has not given him the true freedom and clearness of mind to receive it; and to do otherwise, is to transgress that Golden Rule delivered by *Paul, viz. To walk by the same Rule, according to what we have attained; and if any be otherwise minded*, said he, *God will reveal it unto him.* And if this Advice could find place, it would bring the differences among those called Christians, in point of judgment, into a very small and narrow compass, and they would understand one another far better than now they do.

But again, seeing *J. A.* is so absolute and peremptory, that the *Presbyterian Confession*

of

of Faith and Catechism, (and why not the *Presbyterian Directory* also) materially considered is infallible, and yet is but a Book of their making, and the consequential part of it, the alone Fruit and product of their humane Spirit, since they deny all pretence to an inward Dictate or Direction of Gods Spirit in the Case; why should the said *J. A.* so oft Taunt and upbraid us with an Infallible Spirit, and Infallible Speaking and Writing, and Inspiration; for now it seems a meer humane Spirit hath inspired those that gave forth the *Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism*, to write every Article and Sentence of it Infallibly, according to *J. A.* his high estimation of them.

But whereas *J. A.* dareth us, *To give any instances of any Articles and Definitions contained in the said* Confession and Catechism, *that are not Scripture Sentence materially or formally considered.* This hath been done many times over and over again by our Friends in *England*, and by some of us here in *Scotland*, particularly by *R. B.* in his *Catechism and Apology*, and by me in my Book of *Immediate Revelation*: And there was in the year 1651. an intire examination of that *Confession of Faith* published in Print by one *W. Parker*, (who was not called a *Quaker*, and whose words in all things we do not own) and to the said

Exa-

Examination *J. A.* or any of his Fraternity is referred, where I am abundantly perſwaded he hath ſaid more againſt it, and many Articles contained therein, *viz.* in the ſaid *Confeſſion*, then ever *J. A.* or any of his *Presbyterian* half Brethren ſhall be able to Anſwer; which whole Book lyeth at their door to this day (ſo far as I can underſtand) unanſwered. Another groſs miſtake, or rather abuſe of *J. A.* is, that he alledgeth, *The* Quakers *are againſt all* Confeſſions of Faith and Catechiſms *whatſoever*, *and yet they have* Confeſſions and Catechiſms *of their own.* I ſay this is a groſs abuſe, for we do own, that there may and ought to be Confeſſions of Faith given by True Chriſtians; and alſo we own, that there may be Catechiſms, and that they are uſeful in the Church, and accordingly we have ſuch. And though the Writers of thoſe Confeſſions and Catechiſms, be not abſolutely or univerſally Infallible, yet we hold that none ſhould publiſh any Confeſſion of Faith, or Catechiſm, but in ſuch things whereof they are Infallibly perſwaded by the Spirit of the Lord; and as to other things that may be uncertain or unclear unto them, they ſhould forbear: and ſo every one ſhould Speak or Write, as they have received the Spirit of Faith; as the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaid, *We having received the ſame Spirit of Faith,*

we

we believe, and therefore we have ſpoken; but *J. A.* thinks he may Speak and Confeſs his Faith, without the ſame Spirit of Faith which *David* and *Paul* had: And as for our Catechiſms and Confeſſions of Faith, if we cannot prove them, and all the Articles and Sentences in them, to be according to expreſs Scripture words, then let them not be received. For we profeſs to urge nothing, nor to preſs any thing to be received, as a common Article of Faith, but what is expreſly delivered and Recorded in the Scriptures. And if any ſhould be ſo unbelieving and obſtinate, as not to believe the expreſs Scripture words, we may not urge them, or preſs them thereunto by any Humane or Carnal Force and Compulſion, but only to labour to perſwade them, according to that evidence and demonſtration of the Spirit and Power, as God ſhall be pleaſed to furniſh us withal.

Another great miſtake or abuſe of *J. A.* is, that he alledgeth the Tenth Query is void of Senſe, as if it did import, *That their Juſtification and Sanctification, Faith and Grace, were the Gifts of their Directory, Catechiſm, and Confeſſion of Faith*; and thus becauſe the Query ſaith, *The Gifts of theſe*, whereas it is plain to any Sober and Rational Perſon, that by *the Gifts of theſe*, the Inquirer meaneth, the Gifts of Juſtification, Sanctification, Faith

and

and Grace; and this is a form of Speech allowed by the *Grammar* it self, and practised by Learned Authors, I suppose far beyond *J. A.* who say not only the Town *London*, or *Rome*, or *Edinburgh*, but also the Town or City of *London*, the City of *Rome*, the City of *Edinburgh*; and therefore why may it not be as well said, the Gift of Faith, of Justification, of Sanctification; and speaking of these in general, why may it not be said, the Gifts of these, which is equivalent to these Gifts: And beside, perhaps all this Quible is only raised upon a mistake of the Transcriber, writing the Gifts of these, for these Gifts; but it seems *J. A.* is barren of matter, when he maketh a mountain of so small a matter, if so be it were an impropriety of Speech. But to deal in earnest with *J. A.* seeing he is so declared an Enemy to Divine Inspiration in our days, we cannot think that he indeed oweth his pretended Justification, Sanctification and Faith unto God, but rather unto those Confessions and Catechisms; for what Evidence or probable ground can he give us, that he hath any Divine Faith, or that which is more than barely Historical and Traditional?

Another gross abuse of his is, *That because we call the Gospel the Power of God*, as we are warranted by the express words of *Paul*, *Rom.* 1. 16. therefore he alledgeth, *That we fain to*

our selves a sort of dumb Gospel, without any Words, or Doctrine. But to remove this abuse, let the Reader know, that by the Gospel, we mean not the Power of God abstractly considered without the Doctrine, and suitable words, inwardly or outwardly Preached, nor yet the Doctrine and Words without the Power, and Life, and [illegible]nd, but both conjunctly. And although we do readily acknowledge that the Doctrine, when it is outwardly Preached by the Spirit of God, and so hath the Power of God accompanying it, is and may be called Gospel; yet we cannot simply or absolutely limit or confine the Gospel to outward Preaching of men; otherwise what God or Christ Preaches of his Love and Mercy to men in their Hearts, should not be the Gospel, nor should that be Gospel which God Preached unto *Abraham*, and also unto *Adam* after the Fall; seeing to none of these God did use the Ministry of men. To conclude therefore, what God reveals of his Love and Mercy for mens Salvation, whether without, or by the Ministry of men Spiritually fitted and called thereunto is the Gospel, and that Gospel may be called the Power of God unto Salvation, because it is mighty and powerful in operations; but yet it doth not follow, that the Preaching of the Letter without the Spirit and Power of God, is the Gospel, as *J. A.* would have it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

IN the pretended Survey of the 12th Query, *J. A.* calls the Inspirer of the *Quakers*, as he scoffingly nameth it, as being both a great Jester, and a great Fool also, because the Inquirer asketh, *Whether Original Sin be the Devil, seeing the Word Original signifieth the Beginning.* But I ask *J. A.* why may not the Devil be called sin, or unrighteousness in a certain sense, as Christ is called righteousness frequently in Scripture? And what is it that made him that was an Angel of Light, to become a Devil, but sin; for when God first created him, he was not a Devil; but he became so, or made himself so, by his sin: And seeing sin made him become a Devil, why may it not receive his Name? And also seeing the Devil stirreth up men to sin, and is the Author of it commonly in mens Hearts, it may very well receive his Name, at least by a *Metonymie.*

Again, is not sin called in Scripture, *The Old Man*, or *Old Adam*, whom we are bidden to *put off*? According to *J. A.* his reasoning; *Sin cannot be an Old Man, because a man is a*

perſon, and then Sin ſhould be a perſon alſo. Again, by his Argument, *God made man, but he made not ſin, therefore ſin cannot be a man:* And thus according to *J. A.* the Inſpirer of the Apoſtle *Paul*, muſt alſo be a Fool and a Jeſter (which were very Blaſphemous to think) becauſe *Paul* calleth ſin in men, *The Old Man*, and compareth it unto man, *having its various Members.*

Now if indwelling ſin may be called man, in any tollerable ſenſe of a *Metonymie*, or *Allegory*, according to Scripture, why not alſo Devil, Serpent, *Leviathan*, as alſo it is called fleſh. And whereas the Inquirer doth ask, what did Chriſt come to deſtroy? was it not the Devil and his works? To this *J. A.* giveth no direct Anſwer; for certainly that Devil whom Chriſt deſtroyeth in mens hearts; and that Serpent whoſe head Chriſt the Seed of the Woman doth bruiſe, is ſin, which is the Serpents birth in mens hearts, and which receiveth his Name, as the Child doth the Name of its Parent.

Now as to the words Original ſin, as they are no expreſs Scripture words, ſo they have an Ambiguous or doubtful ſignification, and therefore it were better to leave thoſe words, and to keep to expreſs Scripture. For in one Senſe, there can be no Original ſin, becauſe originally all things were good, and

ſin

ſin came in not with the Creation, but ſometime after it.

But how ſin hath come generally upon all men, as whether by the bare imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, without the conſent of his Poſterity, or by and through their conſenting thereunto, is the true ſtate of the queſtion, which *J. A.* hath not as yet reſolved. And it ſeemeth moſt abſurd that God ſhould reckon any ſinners for *Adam*'s ſin, without the leaſt conſent or concurrence on their part, which is not juſt among men; and certainly what is unjuſt with juſt men, is not juſt before the Lord, who is infinitely juſt and good. And ſeeing none are Righteous or Juſt by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, the ſecond *Adam*, without their Faith in him, and conſenting to his Righteouſneſs; ſo none are unrighteous by the firſt *Adam*, but ſuch as conſent to his ſin. But again, when this conſenting to *Adam*'s ſin took place in his poſterity, as namely whether before they came into the womb, (as thoſe who hold the pre-exiſtence of all Souls from the beginning, do affirm, whereof there have been and are divers among thoſe called Chriſtians) or whether after they are born, when they grow up to the capacity of diſcerning good from evil, is yet another Queſtion, which *J. A.* hath not touched, far leſs reſolved. And it were well that men

were more inquisitive to find the way, how to get sin put out, than how it came in; seeing they are generally sensible that that it hath entred, and got too great place in them. But as to the determinate and precise time, when sin hath entred into mens Souls; as it is no part of the Query, so it is none of my present work to determine. It shall suffice enough to reply unto *J. A.* that all his Arguments for the in being of sin in mens hearts, fall short to prove that it came into them without their own consent; or that God doth impute sin unto any Soul, simply and barely for the Fact of another; for that is to contradict the common instinct of Justice that is placed by the Lord, the judge of the whole Earth in all men.

Another Question which *J. A.* raiseth on this Head, although it be no part of the Query, is, *Whether that Seed of Concupiscence which is felt to move in those who are Travelling uprightly towards perfection, be really and properly their sin, or imputed unto them; for sin by the Lord, when not consented unto, in any measure or degree.* And he resolveth it in the affirmative, but with very weak and insufficient Arguments. 1. He saith, *By the sin of* Adam, *all were made sinners*, Rom. 5. 16, 17, 18. But what then, doth it therefore follow, that they were made sinners without their own consent;

let

let him ſhow us this any where in Scripture? 2. He ſaith, Adam *was the repreſentative Head of mankind.* But I ſay again, it doth not thence follow, that his ſin is the ſin of his Poſterity without their conſent; no more than it doth follow, that becauſe Chriſt is alſo the Head of every man, that his righteouſneſs becometh theirs, without their conſent; and their actual receiving of him, and believing in him. 3. He ſaith, *There are motions, which are ſinful, though not conſented to, when they are tampered with, or liſtned unto.* I Anſwer, to tamper with any evil motion, or liſten thereunto, is ſome meaſure of conſenting; but when the evil motion is not tampered with, nor liſtned unto, in any meaſure, this reaſon hath no place. And here he alledgeth on me, that as he was informed I did once diſpute for a Profeſſors place, which to what purpoſe he mentioneth this, I donot underſtand; however I tell him, his Information is falſe, for I never diſputed any where in all my life, for a Profeſſors place. 4. He argueth, *That as Gracious Principles are Grace, ſo an evil principle is ſin.* I Anſwer, there is a Principle of Grace, in the Souls of Bad men, which is Grace in it ſelf, and Truth and Righteouſneſs, yet it is not their Righteouſneſs, nor Grace, becauſe they joyn not with it, and even ſo an evil Principle in a good man, though evil,

and ſin is not his ſin, when he doth not joyn with it. 5. He Argueth, *That which inclineth men to ſin, muſt be ſin.* But if this Argument hold, then the Devil muſt be ſin ſtill, becauſe he inclines men to ſin. Again, as to what he alledges that *Paul* ſaid, *Sin did dwell in him, from* Rom. 7. I Anſwer, *J. A.* hath not proved that *Paul* was at that time in that condition, whereof he makes mention, and although he ſpeaks of the dwelling of ſin, in him, *viz.* in reſpect of his former condition; yet he telleth, that not his mind, but his fleſh, was the Subject, where it did indwell. And therefore when *J. A.* ſo inſultingly inquireth at me, *What is the Subject of that evil thing or motion; for ſeeing it is an accident, it muſt have ſome ſubject, without which it cannot exiſt.* I Anſwer him from the Apoſtle; the Subject of it, in good men, is not the mind, or more noble part, which is immortal, but the fleſh. And ſeeing it is not lodged in the mind of any righteous man, it cannot defile it, when it is not in any wiſe conſented unto. Nor doth it follow, that becauſe an evil motion may be in the fleſh or mortal part, the Devil is alſo lodged there too; this is nothing but a fooliſh inference of *J. A.* his making; and therefore let him take home his ſilly Jeſt to himſelf, where he ſaith, *It is better to lodge ſin alone, than it and the Devil too; for two ſuch*

Devils

Devils are worse together, than any of them it self. I say, nothing of this can be inferred from our Principle; but let *J. A.* take heed, lest sin and the Devil too, have not too great place in him, which so leads him forth to foolish Jesting, and reproaching the Blessed Spirit of Truth, in its Holy Inspirations, in the Hearts of Gods People. But why is *J. A.* so offended with the Inquirer, for asking if Sin be the Devil; seeing he calleth sin, *Devil*, saying, *Sin and the Devil, are two worse Devils, than one alone.*

To conclude this matter, *J. A.* doth plainly acknowledge, *That by Christ his destroying the Devil, is meant the destroying his Power and Kingdom in the World*, pag. 137. And not the Annihilating the Devils entity and being. Is it not then clear, that *J. A.* his own Confession, the Devils Power and Kingdom is called Devil in Scripture, and what is that but sin; and thus we see, how at last he is forced, at least indirectly, to acknowledge, what he hath so earnestly opposed.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

IN the pretended Survey of the thirteenth Query, *J. A.* accuſeth the Spirit in the Inquirer, *As being either an ignorant Blockhead, or elſe a Captious Sophiſter*, and withal alledging, *That the Queſtion as it is propounded cannot be Anſwered; and that therefore it muſt be purged from a plurality of Interrogations.* But all this Accuſation proceeds upon a wrong Suppoſition, *viz. That Chriſt hath not died for all men*: And therefore, although *J. A.* cannot Anſwer the Queſtion according to his own falſe Principle; yet according to Scripture it can be well Anſwered, *viz. That Chriſt hath died for all the ungodly and ſinners, that they ſhould live unto him.*

In the next place he offereth to give ſome clear demonſtrations from the Scriptures, *That Chriſt did not die for all men.* But in his whole Survey of this Queſtion, conſiſting of above 13 Pages, he bringeth not one place of Scripture, which ſaith expreſly, *That Chriſt died not for all men*: And for my part, I have Read the Scriptures all over ſeveral times, but to this day I could never find any ſuch place:

But

But on the contrary, I have found divers places of Scripture expreſly affirming, *That Chriſt hath died for all*, as *Iſaiah* 53. 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. *Heb.* 2. 9. and 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. and 1 *Joh.* 2. 2. And therefore his clear demonſtrations, are but his own conſequences gathered not from Scripture, but from his own miſtakes; and his abſurd Interpretations of Scripture, the which we are not bound to receive, ſeeing he has renounced all claim to the Inſpiration of that Spirit that gave forth the Scripture.

And becauſe it would be too tedious, and to little purpoſe to Anſwer particularly to every frivolous Objection he maketh againſt the Doctrine of the Scripture, *Concerning Chriſts dying for all men*: I ſhall lay down ſome general Heads or Propoſitions according to Scripture, by which all his Objections ſhall be ſufficiently Anſwered.

PROP. I.

ALthough Chriſt died for all men, and thereby gave a Teſtimony of Gods great Love, and alſo of his own to all mankind, according to 1 *Joh.* 4. 9, 10. and 1 *Joh.* 3. 16. and *Rom.* 5. 8. Yet it doth not follow, that Chriſt or God hath equally conferred upon

on all, the Spiritual Bleſſings procured by his Death; for the Love of God being free, he might extend it in different meaſures or degrees to men, as it pleaſed him, according to his own infinite Counſel, which we cannot comprehend: And whereas *Joh.* 15. 13. it is ſaid, *Greater Love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his Life for his Friends.* This doth not import, as *J. A.* doth alledge, *That Chriſt died only for his Friends*, but it expreſſeth the ſuperabundant Love of Chriſt above the Love of all other men, in that whereas it is the greateſt Teſtimony of the love among men, a man to die for his Friend; yet Chriſt hath given a far greater, in that he died for his Enemies, *Rom.* 5. 10.

PROP. II.

CHriſt died in ſo far, even for theſe who periſh; that by vertue of his Death all ſuch have a day of Viſitation, wherein it is poſſible for them to be ſaved, during which day: Chriſt Jeſus doth Enlighten them with his true Light, to ſhew them their way unto God; and alſo he breaths upon them in ſome meaſure, ſufficient unto their Converſion, with his Spirit of Grace to draw and gather them, whereby it is poſſible for them within

the

the day of their Viſitation to believe, and ſo to be ſaved: And this Grace of Illumination, which hath a Sanctifying and renewing vertue in it comes upon them, as the real effect and conſequence of what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered for them, God having ſo ordered it, in his infinite Love and Wiſdom, that this Grace, whereby he converteth Souls ſhould flow, and run forth unto us in that way, and as it were through the Conduit of Chriſt his Blood; ſo that the Sufferings of Chriſt were as the opening of a great Fountain, out of which the abundant Grace of God, that formerly as it were but droped on mankind, is in the Latter days poured forth upon them, as it was promiſed ſo to be; for which read and compare theſe following Scriptures, *Iſaiah* 44. 3. *Joel* 2. 28. *Jeremiah* 31. 31. *Pſal.* 68. 18. *Eph.* 4. 7, 8. and *Joh.* 1. 16, 17. *Rom.* 5. 18.

PROP. III.

WHen once the day of mens Gracious Viſitation is at an end, which is poſſible to come to paſs on many, and doth no doubt come to paſs on many, even when living in the World, after they have finally rejected the Call of God in their Souls, and wilfully reſiſted, and hardned themſelves againſt his tender dealings by his Spirit of Grace

Grace, gently working on their hearts: I do not say that Christ hath died for the sins of all, or any one of those, after the said day of their Visitation is at an end: For although we read in Scripture, *That Christ hath died for the remission of all sins past*; in the time of ignorance when God winked, and for the redemption of the transgressions under the first Covenant, according to *Rom.* 3. 25. and *Heb.* 9. 15. Yet we find not that Christ hath died for all sins of men that were to come, after they were Enlightned. And although no doubt all sins, as well to come as past, are pardoned upon Repentance; and that Christ hath died for such sins, as are repented of by any men, at any time, when they truly repent; yet seeing many sins are committed, by many, that are never repented of, and wherein they die finally Impenitent and hardned against Gods tender Call and Visitation of Grace in their Souls: Also seeing some sin wilfully and fall away, after they have received the knowledge of the Truth, and die in that state, the Scripture is plain, *That there remaineth no more Sacrifice for them.* Also *John* speaketh, *Of a sin that is unto death*, of which he Writes; I do not say, that such a one is to be Prayed for: And what is such a sin, but a final impenitence, even until the day of Visitation be over, and God be provoked to give them up,

up, even as many at this day, becauſe they received not the Truth in Love, are given up to the ſtrong deluſions of Antichriſt, to believe Lies, and die in that ſtate.

PROP. IV.

MEn are not according to Scripture called Reprobates within that time, that God dwelleth with them by his Grace, in order to convert them, and renew them by Repentance; far leſs doth the Scripture ſpeak of mens being Reprobated from all Eternity, or before the foundation of the World, as ſome alledge; although we read of an Election in Chriſt before the foundation of the World. And to ſay that God doth ſimply Reprobate men, while he is calling them to Repentance, and graciouſly inviting them in true Love to be reconciled with him, is an abſolute inconſiſtency. The time therefore of any mans final Reprobation is after this day of Grace is over, and God hath wholly left ſtriving with him in order to his Converſion. We muſt therefore diſtinguiſh betwixt perſons, and their ſins and ſinful ſtate; for alſo ſin, and ſtate of ſin is always rejected and reprobated, yet not the perſons, until their day be over. For the Scripture ſpeaketh abundantly

boundantly of a day of Grace that all men have, or are to have, wherein the Lord not only visits them, but even endures with much long suffering the Vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. These only therefore are properly Reprobates, who are finally given over to a Reprobate mind, after their day of Grace is over; and Gods fore-knowledge and pre-ordination respecteth them only as such.

PROP. V.

ACcording to what is formerly said, it may be further concluded, that although Christ hath died for all men in a day, so that within that day of Grace, all their sins past and to come as well as present, are pardonable for Christs sake, no man being absolutely reprobated, and finally given over, within this day of Grace; yet that day being at an end, Christs death is no more a Sacrifice for them, nor for their sins; and because of their rejecting so great Salvation offered them by Christ, all their former sins which formerly were not imputed unto them, so as to hinder Pardon, are newly charged upon them, and that in the just Judgement of God, seeing they deny the Lord that bought them, and account his Blood, as an unholy or common thing.

thing. And in this respect Christ hath Died for no Reprobates, to wit, as such: And he hath neither died nor Prayed for the World; in that sense, to wit, as it signifieth them, who die in the final unbelief and impenitency, and so perish, for so I find the term World sometimes to signify in Scripture. And if *J. A.* think that this is a contradiction; as implying that Christ hath died for all men, and yet hath not died for Reprobates, who are a great part, or the greatest part of mankind; I shall mind him of a Rule in his School-Logick, that he doth so highly magnifie, to wit, that Propositions are not contradictory, although the one be Affirmative, and the other Negative, unless they be *in ordine ad idem*, in order to the same, and in regard of the same Circumstances of time, place, condition, *&c.*

1 Cor. 11 32.

PROP. VI.

THe Sacrifice of Christs death did truely extend, for the remission of sins past, from the beginning of the world; hence all the Believers that lived under the Law, and Prophets, and before the Law were saved by Faith in Christ, and had their sins pardoned; not by the Offering of the Blood of Bulls and Rams;

but by the Blood of Christ, who was to die for them, and in whom they believed; and died in Faith; as is clear out of many places of Scripture, and especially the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. And by vertue of Christ's death, and offering once for all men, have had or have, or shall have a day of Visitation, and offer of Grace through Christ, even these who lived before Christ came in the flesh, in that prepared body as well as others. And therefore all who finally perish, and are lost in whatever Age or time of the World they lived, they must be accountable to Christ who is judge, both of quick and dead, and Lord of both; and they shall be punished with Fire of Hell, for neglecting and despising the Salvation offered by him. And although this is a great Mistery and hard to be uttered, how this Gospel Invitation, and Visitation cometh unto all, and how all shall be accountable unto the man Christ Jesus, on the score or account of his dying for them; yet seeing the Scripture is so plain and clear for it, it is better to believe it, than curiously to dispute how, or after what manner it comes so to be: And the opening of this and other great Misteries of the Christian Religion, is approaching to many, who as yet do not see them; and when men are prepared to receive

Act. 10. 42.

Act. 17. 31.

ceive them, God will no doubt give that, and all other *Good things to thoſe that Love and Fear him.*

PROP. VII.

AND whereas *J. A.* and others do urge, *That either Chriſt has died for thoſe that periſh, abſolutely or conditionally:* I Anſwer, partly both, firſt he hath ſo far died abſolutely even for thoſe, as by his death and righteouſneſs, Grace is come upon them, ſufficient both to Faith and Salvation, within their day of Grace; which Grace is given them abſolutely for that time, and doth continue with them, until the day of their Viſitation be at an end, and then it is taken away from them, the Lord ceaſing to ſtrive with them any more for their Recovery. *Secondly*, I ſay, Chriſt hath died conditionally, even for thoſe that periſh, that they might have been ſaved, within their day, upon the condition of their believing: And whereas *J. A.* doth object, *That ſeeing the condition it ſelf*, to wit, *Faith is the Gift of God, then he either beſtowes it upon them abſolutely or conditionally; if abſolutely, then Reprobates ſhall thereby be made Believers, and ſo be ſaved; if conditionally, then the ſenſe will be, that God beſtowes Faith in Chriſt*

upon Reprobates, upon condition that they first have Faith in him. To which I Answer, that Faith is indeed the Gift of God, and God is willing to bestow it upon them, and work it in them; not upon the condition of their first believing, before he give them to believe, which I confess would imply a contradiction; but the condition on which God is willing to work Faith in them is, if they do not finally resist his Spirit of Grace, having offered Faith unto all men, which moveth and draweth or inclineth them to believe; for to every one that doth not resist the motion of Gods Spirit of Grace, he giveth Faith, and worketh it in them: And though men cannot actually do any thing that is good, or acceptable unto God, before they believe; yet when the Visitation of God's Grace is upon them, by the help thereof they may cease from resisting the Spirit of God: And whereas I have heard it again urged by others, *Either God willeth that men should not resist the Spirit of Grace absolutely or conditionally; if absolutely, then say they, men shall not resist it; for what God willeth absolutely, must certainly come to pass, if conditionally, then the Argument may be renewed concerning that condition, and so without end.* To this also I Answer, that God willeth absolutely, that men should not, or do not resist his Spirit of Grace; for seeing

ſeeing God commandeth that men do not reſiſt, it is evident that it is the abſolute or poſitive will of God, that they do not; for whatever God commandeth is according to his will. But it doth not follow, that whatever God willeth men to do, that muſt certainly be done; for how often do men act contrary to the Will of God, in ſome ſenſe, although when they do ſo act, it is not without his permiſſive will, whereby he ſuffers them ſo to do. Indeed I grant, that whatever God willeth that he do himſelf, that muſt certainly be done, and it cannot be reſiſted; and therefore when God puniſheth the diſobedient, it being his own act of Juſtice, and proceeding from his own holy and juſt will, it cannot be reſiſted in that reſpect. I have the more largely Anſwered this Objection, becauſe it is judged by many of the Adverſary ſide, to be unanſwerable: But I hope by what is ſaid, the Impartial Reader, who loveth Truth, may perceive, that there is indeed no ſtrength in it; and it is ſo far from being a clear demonſtration, that it is nothing elſe, but a Captious Sophiſm, and Fallacy.

Moreover, whereas *J. A.* claſſeth us with the *Arminians* and *Jeſuits*, for holding this Doctrine, *That Chriſt Died for all men.* I Anſwer, ſeeing both *Arminians* and *Jeſuits* pro-

ſeſs to hold many other Doctrines, which *J. A.* doth alſo profeſs, as that there is one God, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt; it is no juſt ground of reproach to us, to own that Doctrine, which the Scripture doth own, although *Arminians* and *Jeſuits* profeſs to own that alſo: But it is the greater ſhame to *J. A.* and his party, who profeſs to be more Orthodox, to be guilty in denying that, which Adverſaries confeſs; we find that not only wicked men, but the Devils alſo confeſſed unto Chriſt, which yet is no reproach unto Chriſt, nor to the true Confeſſors of him.

And laſtly, whereas *J. A.* pretendeth to Anſwer our Arguments, *For Chriſt his dying for all men*; Some of them he doth not fairly repreſent; and others, being ſome places of Scriptures, he doth only Anſwer, by giving us his private meanings of his own private Spirit, (without any convincing reaſon) of thoſe places of Scripture, which we are no wiſe bound to receive: And at beſt, all his Anſwers proceed upon a bare Suppoſition, that his own Principle is true; which is a common Fallacy, called in the Schools *Petitio Principii*, which is to ſay, *A begging of the Queſtion.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

IN my Answer to *J. A.* his pretended Survey of the 14*th.* Query, I purpose to use the same way as in the former, *viz.* To lay down some Propositions, which may sufficiently Answer to any thing he objects against the Universality of the saving Light and Grace of God unto all men; and in so doing, I shall both save my self and the Reader the pains to follow him in every Trivial thing that is objected.

PROP. 1. In the Question concerning the Universality of Gods Grace sufficient to Salvation; it were altogether wisdom in our Adversaries to forbear pressing so hard in that point, and so positively conclude against us, and not us only, but the Scripture it self, *That many Nations or Kingdoms of the World are utterly excluded from all sufficiency of Saving Grace, and possibility of Salvation; and that upon the account of wanting the Gospel outwardly preached unto them, and benefit of the Scriptures.* Do we not read in Scripture, *That God hath given the Heathens to his Son for his Inheri-*

tance, and the uttermost ends of the Earth for his possession? And doth not Christ invite the most remote and desolate places of the Earth to come unto him, saying, *Look unto me all ye ends of the Earth, and be ye saved*: Mark it is not said, some ends of the Earth, but [*all ye ends of the Earth*;] even as well those to whom the outward Testimony of Christ by the Scriptures is not come, as those to whom it is come. And did not Christ command, *That the Gospel should be preached to all Nations*, even those that wanted the Scriptures Testimony, and therefore the Gospel did belong unto them: even so to speak before it was outwardly Preached unto them, for because it did belong unto them, therefore was it to be Preached unto them; and consequently for the same reason the Gospel doth belong to many at this day, to whom it is not as yet outwardly Preached; and did not *Paul* say, *Rom.* 1.14. *That he was a Debter both to the* Greeks, *and to the* Barbarians, *as concerning the Gospel?* And how can *J. A.* or any of his party who dispute so fiercely against all possibility of Salvation, not only to many thousands among those called the Heathens, but to many intire Nations of them, make it appear that they are utterly and finally excluded from all sufficient means of Salvation. Have they been in Gods secret Counsel to know

know this? or who hath revealed it to them? And if the outward Teſtimony of the Scriptures be not as yet come to divers Nations of the Earth, this doth not hinder, but that the Goſpel doth belong unto them, as well as unto others, to whom they are already come, *Seeing God hath commanded, that the miſtery which was kept ſecret ſince the World began, ſhould now be declared or made known unto all Nations for the obedience of Faith, and that by the Scriptures of the Prophets, according to* Rom. 16. 25, 26. And ſeeing Chriſt hath commanded, *That the Goſpel ſhould be Preached to all Nations*, Dare *J. A.* or any of his party give us the Inſtance of any one Nation now under Heaven, to whom the Goſpel ought not, or may not be Preached, ſuppoſe they altogether at preſent want the outward Teſtimony of Scripure, and knowledge of the Hiſtory of the coming of Chriſt in the fleſh. But if the Goſpel may be Preached to any Nation now under Heaven, then certainly it belongeth unto them, I mean the Goſpel Diſpenſation; for becauſe it belongeth unto them, and is the free Gift of God unto them: And becauſe Chriſt Jeſus hath procured or obtained that priviledge unto the Gentiles, by vertue of his death and blood-ſhed for them, *Having broken down the middle wall of partition betwixt the* Jews *and* Gen-

Gentiles; therefore it is to be Preached unto them: Even as becauſe the King hath given ſome great favour unto his Subjects, it is to be publiſhed or declared unto them, and it is therefore publiſhed unto them, becauſe it is given them; and is not given them, becauſe it is publiſhed; and therefore the *Gentiles* have ſome title or claim to the Goſpel, even before it be publiſhed, and conſequently before the outward publication of it unto them, they are not utterly excluded from the Diſpenſation of Gods Grace towards men. And if any ſhall ſay; The Goſpel is to be Preached to all Nations indeed, (ſeeing Chriſt hath commanded it, and not one Nation is excepted) becauſe that God hath ſome ſcattered up and down all the Nations, who are to be ſaved, as belonging to Gods Election. To this I Anſwer, that according to *J. A.* his way of reaſoning, *God hath none belonging to his Election in many Nations of the World, becauſe they are excluded from all poſſibility of Salvation for want of the Scriptures.*

PROP. 2. Whereas *J. A.* objects againſt the univerſal ſufficient Light and Grace of God, becauſe it is ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *The Natural man does not diſcern, neither can he know the things of the Spirit of God.* I Anſwer, By the Natural man is to be underſtood, the Soul

Soul or Mind of man, as it laboureth to understand Divine things meerly by its Natural faculties of Natural wisdom and understanding, without any Divine illumination: But when it pleaseth God to shine upon man in his Natural state, by his Divine illumination, then he may know something belonging to his Souls Salvation, so far as his weakness can permit, by vertue of the said illumination. For how are men converted from Natural to Spiritual? God dealeth not with men in Conversion, as with Stocks and Stones, but as with Reasonable Creatures, having some capacity of understanding.

PROP. 3. That some in Scripture are said to have neither Ears to hear, nor Eyes to see, nor Hearts to understand, *And that because God hath not given it unto them, which is another objection of* J. A. This doth not prove, that at no time God hath given to those people any measure of sufficient Grace for this great and extraordinary darkness and blindness may be upon them, either because the day of their Visitation is expired altogether, or because of some intermission, that is only to continue for some time; after which they are again to have a new Visitation, so that they may both see and hear, and also understand, if they will not wilfully shut their Eyes.

PROP. 4.

PROP. 4. These who are said in Scripture, as 2 *Thess.* 2. 11, 12. *To be given up to strong Delusions, to believe Lies*; Are such, who when the Truth was made known unto them, received it not in love, that they might be saved, as is clear from *v.* 10. And therefore it doth not follow, as *J. A.* would have it, *That these who are so fearfully blinded by Antichrists delusions, never had a day of Visitation, before they were so blinded:* But on the contrary it is manifest they had, because their blindness is a Judgement inflicted upon them, for their wilful opposing the Light that God gave them sometime formerly.

PROP. 5. Whereas *J. A.* saith, *That the Father draweth not all men to Christ:* I Answer, As this is no where said in Scripture, so it is contrary to Christ his Doctrine, who said, *After I am lifted up, I will draw all men unto me:* And certainly all whom Christ draweth, the Father also draweth; for said Christ, *My Father hitherto worketh, and I work.* Nor do the words of Christ cited by *J. A.* prove the contrary, *Joh.* 6. 45. *Every man that hath heard and learned of the Father comes to him:* For Christ doth not simply say, every one that hath heard of the Father, comes to him; but every one that hath learned, as well as heard; now we do not say that every one hath Learned of

of the Father, although they have heard in some sort; also there is a right and wrong hearing, some hear willingly; and this is only the right hearing; but although all hear one time or another, while their day of Grace last, yet few hear willingly so as to obey, and therefore they come not unto Christ.

PROP. 6. Whereas *J. A.* Argueth again, *That wicked men have not the powers, principles or habits of Grace, and therefore they have not sufficient Grace*; and he laboureth to prove, *They have not the powers and habits or principles of Grace, because otherwise they would be Converts and Gracious men.* To this I Answer, Although wicked men have not these powers and habits, as some call them, actually, yet they have them hiddenly, to wit, in a Seed or principle of Grace, which virtually containeth all these powers and faculties, even as the Seed of a Tree doth virtually contain the Fruit and tree it self. But it doth not follow, that because a wicked man hath a good Seed in him, that therefore he is a good man, no more, than because good Seed is sown in barren ground, that therefore it is fruitful.

PROP. 7. Whereas *J. A.* doth further alledge, *That the* Gentiles *did the things of the Law*

Law mentioned, Rom. 2. 14. *By the meer nature of man, without the Grace of God*; and this becauſe it is not ſaid, *They did the things contained in the Law by Grace, but by Nature.* To this I Anſwer, nor is it ſaid they did the things contained in the Law by the corrupt Nature of man, as it is corrupted in the Fall, and no wiſe healed or reſtored. And certainly corrupted Nature could not do the things contained in the Law; for the Law of God in the Hearts of the *Gentiles*, did require not only the outward action, but the inward purity of the heart; and if this was wanting, they did not the things contained in the Law. But that there was an uprightneſs of heart in ſome of the *Gentiles*, is clear from divers examples of Scripture, as from *Rom.* 2. 14. *They ſhow the work of the Law Writ in their Hearts*; and in the Caſe of *Cornelius*, and alſo of *Abimelech*, *Gen.* 20.6. ſo that God ſaid unto him, *I know that thou didſt this in the Integrity of thy heart.* And therefore that Nature mentioned by *Paul Rom.* 2.14. is either Nature healed and reſtored in ſome meaſure by the Grace of God, as *Auguſtine* did partly expound it, or the innate word mentioned by *James*, to wit, *The Word of Life immediatly grafted, or planted in the Souls of men*, which is a Divine Nature; for the *Greek* word uſed by *James* in that place, doth moſt properly ſignifie, that which is immediately

diately planted in mens Nature, as distinguished from that which they receive by Education or Industry; as when we say, innate wisdom or understanding, and innate goodness, we mean that which a man hath immediately received from God, from his Birth, or Creation, to distinguish it from what he hath acquired by his own pains or labour, in which sense I find both the word ἐμφύτον, and συμφύτον to be used by *Greek* Authors. Now that the *Gentiles* had a measure of Gods Grace bestowed upon them, which for most part they did not improve, is clear as from many other passages of Scripture, so in particular from the Parable of the Prodigal, who received of his Fathers Goods and Substance, as well as the Elder Brother, but he spent it in Riotous living, so that he was left destitute. Now I ask what was that which the Prodigal spent which his Father gave him, and was a Portion of his Fathers Goods and Substance; surely this was not mans own corrupted Nature, nor any faculty or power thereof, for that remained still with him: And therefore it behoved to be the Grace of God.

PROP. 8. Whereas *J. A.* expoundeth, *All men to whom the Grace of God hath appeared*, Tit. 2. 11. *To be all Ranks, Stations and Qualities of men*, &c. This his Exposition contradicteth

dicteth his own Doctrine, who ſo fiercely doth oppoſe the appearing of Gods Grace, not only unto all particulars, but alſo to many or moſt of the Nations of the Earth, who belong to ſome of the Ranks, Stations and Qualities of men, ſuch as theſe numerous and great Nations in the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies*, and other remote places, to whom the Doctrine of the Goſpel was not in *Paul*'s time, nor perhaps ſince outwardly Preached, at leaſt to moſt of them. Nor can *J. A.* ſhew where all men ſignifie any definit number, and that the ſmalleſt part alſo of mankind. And when *Paul* ſpoke of his warning and teaching every man, his ſenſe is clear, that he excepted none, but ſtill as he had occaſion, he Preached the Goſpel freely unto all, telling them, *That they ſhould repent and believe, that they might receive the remiſſion of their ſins through Jeſus Chriſt; who had died for them, and was riſen again.* But *J. A.* ſaith, *There are many Nations as well as perſons for whom Chriſt died not; and theſe for whom Chriſt died not, are not exhorted to believe that Chriſt died for them; except they ſhall firſt make choice of and embrace him, for their Lord and Saviour, as the Goſpel offers him.* But this is a ſtrange inconſiſtency and contradiction? How can they or ought they to embrace him as their Lord and Saviour, if they are not to believe that he has

died

died for them, even when the account of Christ his dying for mankind is Preached unto them. If God require men to believe in Christ, it is certainly upon reasonable and equal terms; some foundation or ground for such a belief is to be made known unto them, *As that God is Merciful and ready to pardon their by past sins*; which yet cannot be if Christ hath not died for them.

PROP. 9. Lastly, whereas *J. A.* doth argue, *That the Doctrine of Universal Grace, destroyes the Efficacy of Grace, and makes the Effectualness thereof depend upon mans will, to chuse or refuse as he pleaseth, and so the Grace of God shall be subordinate to mans will, which is absurd*: To this it is easily Answered, that the Grace of God is still effectual in its Nature, even when it doth not actually work the Salvation of all; for as much as it is sufficiently able to work it, where it is not resisted, even as the Fire is effectual to Melt the hardest Mettal, if the Mettal be duely applyed to it, but if the Mettal be removed from the Fire, that the said Mettal is not Melted, is not because of the Fire, its not having efficacy enough, but because the Mettal is removed from it, so the Fire still retaineth its efficacy as it had before. Again, the efficacy of Gods Grace dependeth not on mans will, seeing the will

of man doth not influence or excite the Grace of God to make it operate; but on the contrary, it is the Grace of God that doth influence or excite the heart and will of man, without which it cannot do any thing towards mans Salvation; and therefore the Grace of God is never subordinate to the will of man, as *J. A.* doth falsly inferr. And whereas *J. A.* upon this head, *Calls the Grace of God, that can be resisted, (so as the Souls Conversion may be hindred by mans resisting it) ill natured, and false Grace; and moreover addeth, that he will have nothing to do with such Grace that can be resisted, he speaketh here too rashly and presumptuously, for do we not read of some in Scripture that resisted the Truth, and also the Holy Ghost?* As *Stephen* charged the *Jews*, that they did always resist the Holy Ghost, as did their Fathers; and yet according to *J. A.* his Principle, he might as well say, *He would have nothing to do with the Holy Ghost that can be resisted*, and charge it as ill natured and false, which were Blasphemous to affirm. Notwithstanding the same, *J. A.* forgetting himself a few Lines after, saith, *We may indeed resist both the means and motions of Grace, and not improve Grace, as we should and might too*: But (saith he) *God makes it still effectual to the growth by him designed.* This is a contradiction not only to his former Asser-

Assertion, but to it self, as implying that men may improve Grace further than God designed they should. Another very absurd Assertion I find alledged by him, as if Grace did not incline men to perfection, and so there cannot be any resistance of it in that respect. But he may as well say, God doth not command perfection, and so not to be perfect is no sin; for certainly whatever God commands, his Grace inclines men to; yea, it is his Grace in their Hearts, that is a Law, and command unto them. In the close of this Section, *J. A.* falleth on to dispute against the possibility of the falling away of any from real beginnings of Sanctification, the which because he doth it so overly and barely, not bringing Arguments for what he saith, but meerly giving us his own private conjectures on some places of Scripture which are alledged on both sides, as also because it is altogether a digression from the Queries, I shall not insist upon particularly to refute. Only for a service unto those, who may desire Information, as touching the thing it self; because of the seeming contrariety of some places of Scripture, which hold forth the state of some in the Grace and favour of God, as unchangeable and not lyable to any alteration of falling away from the same, are to be understood of the State of such persons, after they have

come to such a growth in Grace, so that perseverance in the same is a reward given them of God, with a respect to their Faithfulness and diligence, wherein they have been formerly exercised. And such especially is that place, *Rev.* 3. 12.

CHAP. XVI.

IN my Examination of *J. A.* his Survey of the 15*th.* and two other Queries, which are the last: I design to be very brief, finding little or nothing in all that he objecteth against us, on these heads, but meer quibbling and trifling, together with some manifest abuses and perversions, part of which I shall take notice of, leaving other things of less moment to the Readers own consideration. And indeed were it not for the worth, and serviceableness of the things themselves proposed in the Queries, and to give to my Native Country, as well as unto other places, a new occasion to Read and Consider those Queries, and the weightiness of the things proposed in them, I had not taken the pains to put Pen to Paper in Answer to *J. A.* notwithstanding his many abusive reflections against me in particular,

cular, considering of what small repute or esteem he is among his Brethren; for although he appears in his Book, as some great Pillar mightily concerned in his Brethrens Quarrel and Cause, yet so small is their esteem of him, or of his work (as it seemeth) that they have suffered him to lye in Prison in the *Tolbooth* of *Edinburgh* for want of Money to pay the Charges of his Book, as is notour to many in this place: It is like *J. A.* will be more provident the next time he engageth against the *Quakers*, to get *John Hamilton*, who hath so highly commended his work, or some other to secure him, from the next inconveniency of that sort.

First of all he begins on this Query, to Quibble about the word [*should*] as if the Inquirer did mean, by these words, *That men should not be perfect*; as if these called Ministers did teach, that it was not mens duty to be perfect, or as if it were not commanded; whereas by the word *should*, is only meant the event or attainment, and not the duty, as sometimes the word doth signifie; a thing most common in ordinary Speech, as when one saith, if such a man had lived long, he should have been Rich, or he should have been Wise, *&c.*

Next he alledges, I abuse some worthy men, because I had cited some, as holding a

Divine condescendence, or *συγκατάβασις* and as if the same did consist in God his remitting or nullifying his Law, in its obligation; but this is a gross perversion, for I did not mean any such thing thereby, as *J. A.* doth alledge, but only that God out of his infinite goodness and wisdom hath given unto men, under the Gospel Dispensation, a Law that is so Gentle and so full of Clemency, as that by the same he requires no more of any of us, but according to the measure of Grace and Strength he doth afford unto us; and still as our Strength and Ability is Increased, the obligation of the Law becomes the greater upon us. Hence it is, that he who is Faithful in every respect to the measure of Grace which he hath received, is indeed a perfect man, and doth please God, although he be not equal in his attainment unto others, who have more given them: For to whom much is given, much is required; and to whom less is given, less is required; which is most clear from the Doctrine of Christ, in his Parable of the Talents.

And whereas *J. A.* doth plead against the possibility of perfection in this Life, by divers Arguments deduced from a misapplication of some places of Scripture; I shall only point at the defects of his Arguments in general, which shall suffice to every one of them, if duely

duely applyed in particular. 1. One great defect of his Arguments is, that the most they prove is, *That man of himself, without the Grace and help of Gods Spirit, cannot attain to perfection*; which we do not deny, but this hinders not, that by Grace he may. 2. A second defect is, that his Arguments prove, *That the Saints had their Imperfections and sins, before they were fully washed and cleansed from them*, which we also acknowledge, but this doth not hinder, that some time or other, they witnessed a perfect cleansing before death. A third defect is, his confounding the States and Conditions of the Saints, to wit, *Their weak Estate, when they are but in the warfare, and strugling against sin, with their last and final Estate, wherein they have overcome, and got the Victory.* And lastly, to mention no more, his misapplying the word or term perfect, when it is taken in an higher sense, to the lowest condition of a sinless state, as in the Case of *Paul*, when he said, *Philip.* 3. 12. *He was not as yet perfected*, where he meaneth, certainly, that he had not attained to the highest pitch or condition of Holiness, that was attainable in this Life; which notwithstanding doth not hinder a sinless perfection; for although *Adam* was Created in a sinless perfection, yet certainly he was to have gone on to a higher state of Perfection: And we

Read of Christ who had no sin at all, that he was made perfect through Sufferings. Again, when Christ said, *I work to day, and to morrow, and the third day I am perfected*: This cannot signifie that he had any sinful Imperfection before that time; but his being perfected the third day, signifieth that his work was then to be done, and so that he was prepared for the Glory that he was to receive thereafter.

Again, whereas he maketh some show of bringing our Arguments or Reasons for Perfection, I find not my self concerned to Vindicate those Arguments, as managed by him; because he doth not propose them, either in matter or form as they do require; as also that he alledgeth divers Arguments as used by us in the Case, which I know not, if indeed used by any of us. Nor is it my work at present, to bring Arguments for our Doctrine, that being already done by others, and partly also by me; but to Answer *J. A.* in what he hath against the same.

He alledgeth, that *Paul* must needs have been in that very condition, which he there describes, *Rom.* 3. 14,15,18,23 and consequently there can be no place for the figure called *Metaschematismus*, as I did alledge, except I will say, that *Paul* then did not with his mind serve the Law of God. But how weak and frivolous is his reason here? Could not

Paul

Paul in the ſame diſcourſe, ſpeak of ſomething that was truly his preſent condition, and of ſome other thing that was not? Is it not clear that *James* doth ſo in his Epiſtle, when he ſaith of the Tongue, *Herewith Bleſs we God, and herewith Curſe we men. My Brethren theſe things ought not to be ſo.* Now according to *J. A.* his highly admired *Logick*, *James* behoved tobe both a Bleſſer of God, and Curſer of men at the ſame time, ſeeing he uſeth the firſt perſon to expreſs both, and the like Impertinency *J. A.* is guilty of, in ſaying the word cleanſeth, 1 *Joh.* 1.7. Being in the preſent Tenſe, imports the Sanctification of Believers to be imperfect in this Life; for the word is alſo uſed in the preſent tinſe. And ſecond by *J. A.* his reaſon, the word juſtifieth, *Rom.* 8. 33. importeth an imperfect Juſtification, contrary to *J. A.* his expreſs aſſertion.

Again he alledgeth, that the words in *Eccleſiaſt.* 7. 20. *There is not a juſt man upon the Earth that doth good and ſinneth not*; Have the Verb in the indicative Mood, and not in the Potential ſignified frequently by the ſecond future, as I did affirm. But this is a bare evaſion, and no direct Anſwer to my Aſſertion? And I ſay again, the ſecond future, even that of the indicative, may be turned into the Potential Mood, as it is often at other times, becauſe the *Hebrew* Language hath no

Poten-

Potential Mood distinct by it self. Again, whereas he urgeth, *That* Solomon *must needs understand Actual Sinning, and not a bare possibility of mens sinning, for who would be ignorant of that?* To this I Answer, that *Solomon* did not mean a bare possibility, but such a possibility as did infer the great danger and hazard that men were under to sin, if they were not duely watchful: And although all men did know this, yet they did need to be admonished of it; for some parts of the Scripture are for admonition, and putting us in remembrance, and not barely for Information. How oft doth the Scripture tell us, that all men are Mortal, and must die, which yet none are ignorant of, although they oft forget that it is so, and therefore need often to be remembred. But by *J. A.* his *Logick*, either men are ignorant, that they shall die, or the Scripture saith so in vain. Who seeth not here, the weakness of *J. A.* his Reasons, which I am already weary to repeat, or spend my time and pains on such stuff; and therefore shall hast to an end of the whole. Only I cannot but take notice, with what confidence *J. A.* doth conclude, *That the Apostles and Prophets their Writing the Scriptures, was an Action surely defective and imperfect, as to the exact and compleat degree of Love to God and men*, &c. But where doth he read any such

such assertion in Scripture? Or by what consequence doth he prove it? Suppose they did not what they did in the highest degree, that men could attain to; this doth not prove any sinful defect in what they did. For it did sufficiently Answer to the exactness of the Law, if what they did was, with all that degree of Love to God and men, that was possible for them, at that time to perform.

CHAP. XVII.

J. *A.* in his pretended Answer to the *16th* Query; first of all beginneth to accuse the Inquirer, *As guilty of a leud Calumny, in charging his Brethren, for holding Salvation by Self-works, and Self-Righteousness; whereas they disclaim Salvation by the best works of the Saints.* But *J. A.* in this, as in other things, doth grosly abuse his Reader, and falsly accuse the Inquirer. For doth not *J. A.* know, that to Query a thing is no positive conclusion, either for or against it. And albeit the Inquirer did know, that in words ye cry down all self-works, and self-righteousness; yet he had but too much ground to question you, about them, seeing ye are generally found

so

ſo much practiſing them; and if they be not ſo much as uſeful means or helps of Salvation, why do ye both ſo much practice them and plead for them, as *J. A.* hath done at great length, for Preaching, and Praying, and Singing without the Spirit, all which are nothing but Self-righteouſneſs. Another fault that *J. A.* committeth here is, that he confoundeth the meritorious cauſe of Salvation, with the ſubordinate and inſtrumental means thereof. For although thoſe called Proteſtants deny the Saints good Works, that are wrought by the Spirit, to be ſtrickly the meritorious cauſe of Salvation; yet generally, or for the moſt part, they deny not, that they are means of Salvation, and neceſſary in order thereunto, which yet *J. A.* ſeemeth here altogether to deny. And as to that place of Scripture cited by *J. A.* to prove, that the Saints are not ſaved by any work of righteouſneſs, even wrought by the Holy Spirit in their hearts, *viz. Tit.* 3.5. He could not have brought a more convincing Teſtimony againſt his falſe Doctrine, than that very place: For after that *Paul* ſaid, *Not by works of Righteouſneſs, which we had done,* (*viz.* by any power of our own) he immediately addeth, *That God ſaveth us according to his Mercy, by the waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*: Which Regeneration

tion and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, comprehendeth the whole work of Sanctification in the Saints.

And here *J. A.* goeth on at his old rate of multiplying falſe accuſations and perverſions and perverſions againſt us: Some of the chiefeſt whereof I ſhall briefly mention. 1. *That we hold a* Popiſh *Juſtification.* 2. *That in one of our Books called,* A Confeſſion of Faith, p. 21. *We deny to be juſtified by Righteouſneſs received of us by Faith, and alſo by a Righteouſneſs imputed unto us.* All which are moſt groſs Forgeries and Slanders, for the words in that page 21. ſay expreſly. *That acceptance with the Father is only in Chriſt, and by his Righteouſneſs made ours, or imputed unto us.* And the ſaid Book denyeth not that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is received by Faith, that is the Gift of God, but both that Faith and imputation, which is only and alone the Creatures act, or work without the Spirit of Chriſt, we do juſtly deny to have any place in our Juſtification. 3. Whereas in the ſaid Book, our Friends alledge, it is not Acts of Righteouſneſs as done by us, nor as inherent in us as Acts, by which we are accepted of God, and juſtified before him, but by Chriſt the Author and worker of thoſe Acts in us, and for us, *&c.* He moſt groſly perverteth the ſober and honeſt intent of thoſe words, as if

by

by them, they underſtood, only that they hold not themſelves juſtified by all Acts, as Blaſphemy or any other groſs ſin. But who ſeeth not that this is a moſt groſs perverſion, for certainly, all Righteous Arts of all ſorts they exclude, when they ſay, not by Acts of Righteouſneſs; and therefore when they ſay, it is not Righteous Acts as Acts, whereby we are juſtified, their meaning is moſt plain and obvious, as Acts being underſtood, to be only, even as Acts of Righteouſneſs, and not ſimply and barely as Acts; though upon this meer *Grammatical* Quibble *J. A.* buildeth all his loud clamour againſt them. But *J. A.* ſhould know better, that when the Senſe is obvious, a word may be underſtood, that is not expreſſed in the Sentence, as ſo it is in this preſent Caſe. A fourth groſs Perverſion of his, that he ſaith of me, in my Book called *Quakeriſm no Popery*, I affirm, *That we are juſtified by our inward Graces immediately*, *J. A.* doth underſtand, that I mean without all reſpect to Chriſt, which is a moſt groſs perverſion; for the expreſs words of my Book are theſe following, *The Righteouſneſs of God and Chriſt by which we are moſt immediately and nearly juſtified, is Chriſt himſelf*, (and then I add) *and his work of Righteouſneſs in us by his Spirit*, So that I am ſo far from excluding Chriſt, that I ſay in the firſt place, Chriſt himſelf is our Righte-

Righteouſneſs. A fifth groſs Perverſion of *J. A.* is, that in my defunction of Juſtification, I give no other material cauſe of our Righteouſneſs before God, but only our Inward Graces; whereas in the ſaid definition, I mention expreſly Jeſus Chriſt, as being the ground and foundation of our Juſtification, both in what he hath done and ſuffered for us, without us, and as really and truly indwelling in us. A ſixth perverſion of his is, that I confound Juſtification and Sanctification together, making no imaginable diſtinction betwixt them; and that becauſe I ſay, weare juſtified by inward Righteouſneſs, and ſanctified by the very ſame. But this proveth not, that I do not diſtinguiſh them, for one and the ſame thing may have a reſpect to different operations, as well as to different Cauſes. But this reaſoning of *J. A.* is as one would argue, that when a Malefactor is both Condemned and puniſhed for his Crime, that his Sentence of Condemnation, and his puniſhment are one and the ſame, without any imaginable diſtinction betwixt them. As alſo that his Condemnation and guiltineſs are the ſame, ſeeing by his Crime he is both guilty and condemned. But as to Juſtification and Sanctification, that they are diſtinguiſhed (although ſometimes in Scripture, one and the ſame word doth ſignifie both) I willingly grant, and do expreſly mention them

as distinct in my Book, which I need not here repeat.

And whereas *J. A.* doth not only accuse me in particular, as holding a *Popish* Justification, but saith further, *That* Bellarmine *himself was never more* Popish *on that Head.* Surely this his assertion proceeds either from great ignorance or something worse. For *Bellarmine de justif.* lib. 5. cap. 17. holdeth, *That good works do merit Eternal Life condignly, not only by reason of Gods Covenant and acceptation, but also by reason of the work it self; so that in a good work proceeding from Grace, there may be a certain proportion and equality unto the reward of Eternal Salvation*; and to the same purpose writeth *Gabriel Vasquez*, a Papist: But no such thing is affirmed by any of us, nor by me; but on the contrary, in my Book called *Quakerism no Popery*, I altogether deny the merit of the best works, as it signifieth an equality of worth to the reward of Eternal Life. Nor do I in any other case, or sense allow the word merit, with a respect to the best works of the Saints, but in that sober and qualified sense used by divers of greatest note among those called Reformers among the Protestants, as *Melancton* and *Bucer*, and also by the Fathers so called, and which is agreeable to Scripture, which calleth Eternal Life the reward of good works, now reward and

merit

merit are relative terms, as *Richard Baxter* (highly commended by *J. A.* elsewhere) doth acknowledge. And not only the said *Richard Baxter* a great *English Presbyterian*, but divers of the best account in the *Episcopal* way, as particularly *H. Hammond* do hold, that the Saints are justified not by Faith only, but by Repentance, Love and New Obedience, as well as by Faith, as Instruments of Justification; and necessary conditions requisite thereunto, and that Sanctification in the order of Causes is prior to Justification. And *James Durham* a great *Scots Presbyterian*, in his *Commentary on the Revelation*, *Digress.* 11. *saith*, *That such who rest upon Christ for Justification, and acknowledge his Satisfaction, ought not to be blamed as guilty of* Popery; *although they hold that Repentance, Love and other Spiritual Vertues and Graces are necessary to Justification as Faith is.* Seeing then we have some of the greatest note, both among those called *Presbyterians* and *Episcopalians*, who agree with us, in the Doctrine of Justification; it must needs proceed from great prejudice, and untowardliness in *J. A.* to charge us, as being guilty of *Popery*, in that, for which we have not only the Scriptures abundantly to warrant us, but divers also both *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian*, of the best account, to vindicate us. And as for *Henry Hammond*, a man of singular Esteem

in the *Episcopal* Church in *Brittain*, whereof *J. A.* is a professed Member; he doth not only agree with us on this Head of Justification, but also on many other very great and weighty Heads of Doctrine so fiercely opposed by *J. A.* as particularly in those following. 1. *That Christ hath died for men.* 2. *That there is no absolute decree of Reprobation.* 3. *That Gods Grace is Universal.* 4. *That beginnings of Regeneration may be fallen from.* 5. *That these words of* Paul, Rom. 7. 14, 15. *concerning his being Sold under sin, are a* Metaschematismus, *and not the present State that* Paul *was in.* And *J. A.* is extreamly ignorant, if he know not, that an exceeding great number, if not the greatest, of the most judicious persons of the *Episcopal* Church both in *Brittain* and *Ireland*, are of the same mind with the said *H. Hammond* in these things, who therefore are so far from esteeming *J. A.* a Patron, or Advocate of their Church, that they cannot but judge him in so far at best, their Adversary.

Moreover, the great prejudice of *J. A.* against us appears in this, that because I deny all merit strictly considered, he inferreth most absurdly, that if Justice will not exact the very rigid rigour of the Law from us, and take the very *summum jus*, we think to merit our Justification by our inherent Righteousness at

Gods

Gods Tribunal. This I say is an absurd inference, and smelleth ranckly of deep prejudice, and perverseness of Spirit, in *J. A.* in opposition to which, I say, that unless God did not only not exact in his Justice, the rigid rigour of the Law, as he terms it, but did not also pardon and forgive us freely for Christs sake, multitude of sins, so as not only to remit us a Penny, but many thousands of Pounds; neither we, nor any man living could be justified at Gods Tribunal, by the greatest Holiness attainable; for all that the best of the Saints can attain unto, of Holiness or Righteousness, is but their duty, and therefore can be no ransom nor redemption, unto God, for the least by past sin; far less, for many that they have formerly committed.

And whereas in my Book aforesaid, I charged *J. A.* and his Brethren, to be too much one with the *Papists*, in the Doctrine of Justification; both of them denying that the Saints Justified by Christ indwelling in them, as *Luther* expressly Taught in his Commentary on the *Galatians*: And also denying that Gods Justifying his Children is an inward Sentence, or Dictate of his Spirit immediately pronounced in their hearts; to which the said *J. A.* can give no reply, but a meer evasion, and falleth on a fresh to accuse us of *Enthusiasme*, which being already Answered in the

former part, I need not here to repeat. Only I cannot but take notice, how ignorantly *J. A.* oppoſeth the word or term immediate, to the uſe of means, which I have already refuted, and ſhewed how immediate Revelation, ſuch as the Prophets and Apoſtles had, doth very well conſiſt with the uſe of means: And ſo I willingly acknowledge, that true and right means, are as Veſſels, whereby ordinarily our Spiritual Meat and Drink are conveyed to us, ſometimes in the uſe of one mean, ſometimes in the uſe of another; but I hope, when we Eat and Drink, that which is conveyed to us, we Eat and Drink it immediately, See, Taſte, Savour, and Handle, and Feel it immediately, and can well underſtand, when the Meat is indeed in the Veſſel, and when it is empty; and therefore *J. A.* his compariſon in this reſpect, doth altogether halt, and is impertinent.

Another great impertinency and abuſe I obſerve in *J. A.* that whereas *J. A.* blamed our Friends, for ſaying, *We are not juſtified by Acts of Righteouſneſs as Acts*; groſly inferring, that thereby they underſtand, that they are not juſtified by ſinful Acts, as Blaſphemy, Murder, and the like; yet he himſelf uſeth the ſame kind of Expreſſion, as to Faith, ſaying, *The Saints are not juſtified by Faith, as it is a Work*: And according to *J. A.* his Logick,

sick, he means, they are not justified by all works, as Blasphemy, Murder, Idolatry, according to the maxime cited by him, *A quatenus ad omne sequitur Universaliter*. Nor is he less Impertinent to accuse me of a self contradiction, because I distinguish Faith, as it is both receptive and operative; for even the receptive Faith, I hold it to be a work, and also wrought, not only in the Soul, but in some degree by it, as a co-worker through the operation of the Holy Spirit. And I say again, to affirm that the Saints are not justified by Faith, as it is a work, is too nice, and subtle a distinction, unless they mean thereby, as work wrought by them, and as having an equal proportion to the reward of Eternal Salvation. And in this sense, that may be as well said, we are justified by Love, Repentance, and all the Acts of men and Spiritual obedience, but not as works done by us, and having that quality of proportion to Eternal Life.

I shall not insist to Answer particularly *J. A.* his pretended Arguments against Justification by Repentance, and Conversion, and inward Acts of Righteousness, as proceeding from the Spirit of Christ in Believers. The whole force of his reasons being founded on a false Assertion, that hath been often sufficiently refuted both by us, and divers noted men

in the *Episcopal* Church, as if *Paul* did oppose Faith and all works, or the inward work of Regeneration, and Renewing by the Holy Ghost, when he saith, *We are not saved by Works*; and the contrary is manifest from *Tit.* 3. 5. already cited. As for his saying, *That our Souls are of great price in the sight of God, and yet do not merit Heaven, and consequently nor the best Works, although they are said to be of great price with God.* I grant, neither our Souls, nor our Vertues merit Heaven, nor Redemption, as merit signifieth equality: But seeing God hath counted our Souls so dear, as to give so great a price for them, as the Blood of his Dear Son, they may at least be said to have some dignity or worth (which is to say merit) in them; otherwise God would never have given so great a Ransome for them, if the Souls of men, in respect of their Nature and Being, had not been of great value, which is all I understand by the word merit, as used by any of us. And truly for our part, we very rarely, or never use the word merit, as with a respect to the Saints best works, unless, when we are constrained, to bear our Testimony against the ignorance and rashness of those, who so undervalue, and reproach the Blessed Spirit his works in the Saints, as to call them not only unclean and undefiled with sin, but sin it self,

for

for which God might justly condemn them to Hell, as some have not been afraid to affirm.

I take notice also on this Head, how J. A. doth acknowledge, that Repentance, Love and Hope, are necessary to Justification, by way of presence, and existence, but not as conditions or qualifications required in order to Justification, which is another trivolous and groundless distinction; for seeing the Scripture doth equally press our Repentance and Conversion, that we may obtain Forgiveness and Justification, as it doth Faith: The one is certainly as much the condition as the other. And it is not Faith barely considered, which hath the fitness to receive us into the Favour of God, and his acceptance, but as it is accompanied with sincere Repentance and Obedience; for as it is a most unfit and incongruous thing, that any man, while remaining in his unbelief, should be admitted into Friendship and Favour with God, so it is no less unfit, and unagreeable to the Wisdom and Holiness of God, to receive them into his Friendship and Favour, as his Children, who remain still Rebellious and disobedient against him.

As for J. A. his last Assertion on this Head, consisting of above three pages; wherein he only beats the Air, and fights with his own shadow, upon a gross and perverse, but alto-

gether groundless surmise; as if the *Quakers* did deny any imputed Righteousness of Christ, in what he did and suffered for us, but as it is inwardly wrought and inherent in us; for we most willingly and sincerely acknowledge, that the Righteousness of Christ, in what he did and suffered for us outwardly in his own person, is imputed unto us for Justification; and so much I did acknowledge in my Book already mentioned: But we further say, that all to whom that is imputed, which Christ did and suffered for us outwardly, must witness a real and true Conformity both to the Death of Christ, and also to his Holy Life and walk, without which, all mens imputing it unto themselves, is but an airy Dream and Imagination.

There is yet another gross perversion used by *J. A.* in his pretended Survey or Answer of the sixteenth Question; as if the *Quakers* so called, *Seem to deny that there was any Spiritual Worship, in the time of the Old Testament*; And thus because it is said in the Query, that Christ set up the True Worship in Spirit and in Truth above 1600 years ago; but nothing but great Ignorance or prejudice, can from this inferr, that there was not any degree of it in the World in former times. And *J. A.* might as well argue against the Scriptures, that because God saith in the last days, *He*

would

would make a New Covenant with the House of Israel, and Write his Law in their Hearts. That therefore nothing of this sort was formerly in the World. And thus I have done with *J. A.* his long and tedious pretended Survey of this Question, having omitted no thing that seemed unto me Material, and having found in his whole Discourse consisting of about 19 pages, scarce any thing, but gross mistakes and perversions.

CHAP. XVIII.

HEre again *J. A.* in his pretended Survey to the 17th and last Question, beginneth with a most gross perversion, *As if the Quakers (because they would have men to cease from all their own works, meerly acted by the strength of mans Will, and natural Power, without the supernatural and Spiritual aid and assistance of the Spirit of God) would have men to be as senseless Trunks doing nothing*; the bare Rehearsal of which is sufficient Refutation.

Another charge, little less gross is, *That the Quakers hold only* Babylon *to be within in mens hearts*, for which he citeth the aforesaid Book called, *The Principles of Truth*, in several

veral pages. To which I Answer, Although the said Book saith, *That* Babylon, *&c. is within*, yet it doth not say, it is only within, but on the contrary it plainly affirmeth, that all who are in outward Worships (without the leading and enabling of the Spirit of God) painted over with glorious Words, but inwardly full of Abominations; belong to the Kingdom of *Babylon*. And well may that unclean and deceitful Spirit, that acteth all such persons who are levened and governed therewith and thereby, be called *Babylon*, by a Figurative Speech, even as the Soul of a man is commonly called the man, which hinders not, that the people in whatsoever Profession they may be, who are acted by that evil and Antichristian Spirit, are *Babylon*. And as for the *Pope*, and *Popish Church*; as we do cordially joyn with the best and most sincere *Protestants* against them, as being the great and principal Members of that Scarlet Whore *Mystery Babylon*, in whom Antichrist or that Antichristian Spirit hath its chiefest or most principal residence, (and therefore in no respect can be said to favour the *Pope*, or *Popish* Church, on that or any consideration, although we wish the Salvation of the worst,) so we most freely declare, that wherever we find any degree or measure of the same Spirit of Antichrist, and *Babylon*, as too much of

of it is to be found in *J. A.* and too many of his Brethren; we cannot acquit them, from being Members of the same Antichristian body; although in this our upright and honest Testimony we expect neither the kindness of the *Pope*, nor yet of *J. A.* far less the *Popes* Wages or reward, for being so kind to him, as *J. A.* doth most falsly and grosly alledge: And divers of our Friends have suffered deeply under the *Popish* Power, for bearing a Testimony against him and them; which neither *J. A.* nor his Brethren have ever done, but sit warmly at home, without exposing themselves to any suffering on that account.

Having thus, as briefly as I could, given an Answer to *J. A.* his Book, against us, omitting nothing that seemed to be materiall I shall neither trouble the Readers nor my self, with his two Postscripts, to Answer them in particular. The substance of the first Postscript against me, being already Answered in the foregoing Sheets, as to what is any wise material. Or if he suppose any thing is omitted, let him mind me of it in his next; and withall Write an intire and thorough Answer, to what is already said, both here, and in the Treatise called *Quakerism no Popery*, which he hath only but here and there nibled at: And I may, possibly (if God give me freedom and convenience) return him a further Answer.

But

but at present I suppose he hath work enough to lye on his hand, and needs no more.

As for his Postscript against, or for Doctor *Everards* Ghost, as he calleth it: I find not my self concerned to Answer him therein, nor defend every word or Opinion of his; seeing he never went under that Name or Designation with us: Albeit I must needs acknowledge, both my Friends and I, (such of them I mean as have read his Book) have a great love and respect to his memory, which all *J. A.* his bitter Revilings against him, shall never be able to defame: And we believe the said *Everard* hath indeed had rare and singular gifts of Understanding and Openings of Scripture from God, and withal a good measure of Integrity and zeal for the Truth, according to the time, and Dispensation he was in, and in that respect doth truly deserve to be accounted among the Witnesses of Truth in his day, whatever imperfections attended him otherwise, or suppose some mistakes of Judgment in some things, or not so warily cautioning some of his words, as could have been wished. Although I judge that *J. A.* doth seek to fix or fasten upon him divers errors of Judgment, of which he is not guilty, by reason of deep prejudice against him: Partly, whiles he takes the said *John Everard*'s words too Literally and Superficially, which are to be

be understood more Mystically and Figuratively, and partly while he takes that as spoken absolutely, which is but spoken comparative, and by way of some Similitude, and but in some respect.

But before I make a full close, I shall only take notice of two grois and absurd Assertions, (waving others to another opportunity) in his Postscript to me. The one is, that the *Pope* and his Clergy had the true Power and Authority of Ordination, and calling Ministers before the Reformation, neither as Christian, nor as Antichristian. Not as Christian, or else all Christians would have it, nor as Antichristian, seeing these two terms are not contradictory but contrary; for many things and persons too, are neither Christian nor Antichristian. To which I Answer, Every true Minister or Pastor hath his Authority to Execute his Function, as Christian, as not being a strict and formal reduplication, but taken specifically; seeing to be a Christian is as necessary to every true Minister of Christ, as to be a living Creature is necessary to be a man, or to be a man is necessary to be a Souldier, or Magistrate, or Lawyer. And whereas *J. A.* saith, *That Christian and Antichristian are not contradictory terms, seeing many persons are neither Christian nor Antichristian.* I Answer again, as they are taken indefinitely, they

they are not contradictory, but as restricted to such as bear the Name and Profession of Christianity they are perfectly contradictory, so that every one that professeth himself to be a Christian, (such as the *Pope* doth) is most certainly either Christian or Antichristian.

The other gross Assertion of his is, *That the Church of* Rome, *was still a True Church, and not* Babylon, *until the time of Reformation*, viz. *about the time of the Council of* Trent, *or* Luther's *arising, with some others to witness against her; notwithstanding she did hold many fundamental errors, and thus because her errors were not so discovered and demonstrated unto her, before as since that time.* But what a miserable shift and evasion this is, and how contrary to Scripture, and the Judgment of the most sound of all *Protestant* Writers, I leave the Sober Reader to judge. For doth not the Scripture plainly declare, *That Mystery* Babylon *was to rule over the Nations, and deceive them, and Drink the Blood of the Martyrs and Witnesses of Jesus for many Hundreds of years?* And when was it, that she deceived all Nations? Was it only since the Reformation, or rather was not her chiefest time before the Reformation; for since the Reformation many Nations are come to see her Abominations more than formerly. And when was it, *That the Kings of the Earth hath committed*

Fornication with her? Hath it not been for many hundreds of years bygone, rather than ſince the Reformation, when they have begun to hate her, and burn her fleſh with Fire, in ſome ſenſe? *And when began ſhe to drink the Blood of the Saints?* Only ſince *Luther's* days, or the Council of *Trent*: Surely none who hath the leaſt knowledge of Church Hiſtory, but will ſay the contrary, and acknowledge that ſhe has been a Bloody Murtheress for divers hundreds of years long before the Reformation, and conſequently was no true Church of Chriſt. For not only her unſound and corrupt Doctrines, but her wicked Life, and eſpecially her ſlaying the Witneſſes of Chriſt, *And exalting her ſelf over the Kings and Emperors of the Earth*, above ſix hundred years ago (at leaſt) with many other things to be charged againſt her, utterly inconſiſtent with a true Church, doth altogether make her to be no true Church for many hundred of years before *Luther*. And the Lord wanted not Witneſſes ſufficient to demonſtrate her Errors unto her, many hundreds of years before *Luther*; for in every Century God raiſed up his Witneſſes againſt her, as the Church Hiſtory doth plainly and fully relate. Moreover ſhe had both the Scriptures of Truth to Witneſs againſt her, and alſo Gods Holy Checks and Reproofs of his Spi-

rit

rit in her Conscience, that was instead of a thousand, so she wanted not demonstration of her Errors sufficient to render without excuse for many hundreds of years before *Luther*'s time. And now let all sober *Protestants* judge, who doth most favour the Harlot *Babylon*, *J. A.* or we; for by *J. A.* his Doctrine, she is but a Young Woman, as yet, and scarse had time in the World, to bring up her Daughters of Fornication to that Age and Stature the Scripture declareth. How much more true is the Testimony of those Protestants, who date her rising above a Thousand years agoe, her whole time being numbred in Scripture to contain 1260, or 1290. days at most, signifying according to the Prophetick Stile of Scripture so many years; the period or end of which time sincere Protestants are looking for as near approaching, when she shall fall as a Millstone cast into the Sea, and never rise again. But by *J. A.* his account, she began not to rise, till little more then a hundred years agoe; and consequently before her fall, more then a thousand years are yet to expire, which is too glad tydings unto her; but they are false, and too sad tydings to the people of God, if that they were true.

THE END.